

in the Philippines; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COFFEE:

H. R. 4996. A bill for the relief of Joan Esther Hedin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EARTHMAN:

H. R. 4997. A bill for the relief of the estate of Novella Wade; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GIBSON:

H. R. 4998. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vivian M. Meeks; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 4999. A bill for the relief of the Franco-Italian Packing Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H. R. 5000. A bill for the relief of Marion Powell, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 5001. A bill for the relief of Raphael Elder; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5002. A bill for the relief of Maj. Ralph M. Rowley and First Lt. Irving E. Sheffield; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 5003. A bill for the relief of Joseph MacGuffie and Eugene Rohrer; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1412. By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Resolution adopted by the Amalgamated Local 686, International Union of United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, at a meeting of American War Veterans in Lockport, N. Y., requesting immediate abrogation of clause in the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 which disqualifies veterans, employed in plants involved in industrial disputes, from receiving unemployment insurance in the event of a work stoppage; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1413. By Mr. LUDLOW: Petition of residents of Marion County, Ind., urging early and favorable consideration of H. R. 2082 to bring about a suspension of the alcoholic beverage industry for the duration of the emergency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1414. Also, petition of residents of Marion County, Ind., in favor of the passage of S. 623 to stop alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1415. By The SPEAKER: Petition of Social Work Action Committee, Washington Chapter, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to American responsibility for support of UNRRA; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 14, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, October 29, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, we thank Thee that in the fullness of the times the lamps of

prophecy were dimmed by dawn when the Star of the Morning arose, as Thou didst gather Thy light into life and the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us. Once more a weary and war-worn world lifts agonized eyes to the Star of Hope and hails the birth that broke the ages in two. We commemorate His holy nativity, His lowly toil, His lonely way, the gracious words of His lips, the deep compassion of His heart, His friendship for the fallen, His love for the outcast, His care for the sick, the hungry, and the naked.

We thank Thee that He who came to a crib of straw and could not be stopped by a cruel cross is our Great Contemporary, and that when from our plenty we feed and warm and clothe even our enemies, we, too, bow at the manger and keep Christmas in our hearts as the Christ of the Holy Night whispers, "Ye do it unto Me." In His dear name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, December 13, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FILED DURING THE RECESS

Under authority of the order of the 11th instant,

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4805) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, reported it on December 13, 1945, with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 857) thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, it had been my purpose on yesterday to ask that the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] be excused from attendance upon the sessions of the Senate on yesterday and also today because of the attention he is giving to public business. I defaulted on my intention and my obligation, and I now therefore make the request that the Senator from Nebraska be excused for his failure to attend yesterday and that he be excused also from his obligation to attend today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I do not intend to object—I do not know how the Senate can excuse the Senator from Nebraska nunc pro tunc, so to speak. Certainly I am not raising any objection. I realize the Senator from Nebraska is engaged on important public business; but I hardly know how we can go back and excuse him for a previous absence, ex-

cept for the sake of the RECORD. I was simply wondering what precedent and policy we might be making.

Mr. WHITE. It seems to me that if we can excuse a Senator from attendance today, Friday, we can excuse him for his failure to be present on the preceding day.

Mr. HILL. I certainly shall not object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Nebraska is excused.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

ADMINISTRATION OF FEDERAL SEED ACT OF AUGUST 9, 1939

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, recommending the enactment of legislation affecting the administration of the Federal Seed Act of August 9, 1939; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF CERTAIN NAMES

Four letters from the Attorney General, withdrawing certain names from reports relating to aliens whose deportation was suspended more than 6 months, heretofore transmitted by him to the Senate pursuant to law; to the Committee on Immigration.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore and referred as indicated:

A letter from Clarence Poe, president and editor of the Progressive Farmer, Raleigh, N. C., relating to world-wide abolition of peacetime military conscription; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A letter from Carlos P. Romulo, Resident Commissioner of the Philippines, to the United States, transmitting a resolution adopted by the Municipal Council of Santa Rita, Province of Samar, P. I., commending the President and Congress of the United States and General MacArthur for liberating the oppressed people of the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

RELIEF OF PEOPLE OF GERMANY, AUSTRIA, AND HUNGARY

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I have received petitions signed by approximately 100,000 citizens of Illinois reading as follows:

We, the undersigned citizens, respectfully petition the Government of the United States to reestablish postal, wireless, and banking services with Germany, Austria, and Hungary, and to allow relief shipments of clothing, food, and other necessities to save the lives of millions of people in Germany, Austria, and Hungary.

Mr. President, these signatures are evidence of a very extensive anxiety and activity on the part of many of our citizens to be of direct assistance to distressed people in central Europe, particularly the nations named in their petition, as they face disaster, disease, and famine, as well as death from the cold.

Several times I have taken this matter up with the State Department and other Senators have done likewise.

The establishment of these services would allow direct methods of relief.

The same humanitarian reasons that have impelled our extreme generosity in providing billions for UNRRA would seem to urge our Government to rees-

tablish these services so that loyal citizens of the United States could make their own personal and direct contribution to alleviate pain, suffering, and death in this part of the world.

ANTI-POLL-TAX BILL—PETITION

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the Record and appropriate disposition petitions from a number of citizens of the State of Illinois.

The petitioners request me to support the bill (H. R. 7) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers, now on the Senate Calendar. This bill is known as the anti-poll-tax bill. In addition to urging my support, they ask me to vote for cloture so that the bill may be brought to a vote and not be defeated by filibuster.

I ask that one of the petitions be printed in the Record without the signatures attached.

There being no objection, the petitions were received, ordered to lie on the table, and one of the petitions was ordered to be printed in the Record, without the signatures attached, as follows:

Whereas a bloc of southern poll-tax Congressmen are jeopardizing the passage of such vitally necessary legislation as the full employment bill, the \$25 for 26 weeks unemployment compensation bill, the 65-cent-per-hour minimum wage bill, and other important legislation needed to insure full employment and security for the American people; and

Whereas the poll tax disfranchises 7,000,000 white and 3,000,000 Negro people in 7 Southern States and deprives them of a voice before the Government, thereby threatening the rights of all American citizens; and

Whereas the proposed substitute bill, the constitutional amendment, is impracticable and can only serve to confuse the issue and prolong this undemocratic practice;

Therefore we, the undersigned, urge Congress—

To give H. R. 7, the anti-poll-tax bill, precedence on the Senate Calendar;

To vote for cloture so that the bill will come up for a vote and not be defeated by a filibuster;

To vote for H. R. 7, the anti-poll-tax bill, to insure full democracy for all American citizens and provide a truly representative Government.

NAVY RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS—LETTER FROM PRESIDENT OF PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I have just received under date of December 7 a letter from my friend and former colleague, President Harold W. Dodds, of Princeton University, commenting on recent reports that Congress is moving to reduce the Navy Reserve Officers Training Corps organization throughout our colleges and universities to a prewar basis and may reject plans of the Navy Department for providing a large number of officers in the future from Navy ROTC ranks. As Princeton University was one of the institutions designated for carrying on an enlarged Navy ROTC, President Dodds has made a careful study of this matter and his observations, therefore, are especially worthy of our serious consideration.

President Dodds' comments on the development of the ROTC units in our col-

leges and universities are particularly pertinent at this time because he has been urging delay in the adoption of universal military training.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record President Dodds' full letter to me on this important subject.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY,

Princeton, N. J., December 7, 1945.

The Honorable H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: I am deeply concerned as a college president and a citizen by reports that Congress is moving to reduce the Navy ROTC organization to a prewar basis and to reject the plans of the Navy Department for providing a large number of regular officers in the future from NROTC ranks. The purpose of this letter is to call your attention to the reasons why I consider that it would be a grave mistake to follow the course which seems to prevail in Congress.

In the interval between wars, the colleges of the country have had much first-hand experience with the method of producing officers for the armed services through the system known as the Reserve Officers Training Corps. Although at Princeton we had only an Army unit in being, my observation of that unit here, my observation of the operation of the ROTC system in general, and the record which our Army ROTC graduates have made in this war, have convinced me beyond any doubt of the validity of that method for training officers and of the great need for its perpetuation. Because, therefore, I believe that the testimony of those who have had this first-hand experience with the ROTC may be of some value, I am communicating to you some thoughts on the program for a postwar Navy ROTC.

In general, I feel that a reduction of this program to prewar levels would be a mistaken and shortsighted policy. In particular, I feel that there are certain considerations which should be given ample weight in determining future policy.

First, a curtailment or reduction of the present program at this time would represent on the one hand the scrapping of the training which the Navy has given to the trainees now in the program by failing to continue it to the terminal point at which it becomes productive. On the other hand, it would create great difficulties for those colleges in which ROTC units have been set up and in which all the plans and programs have been formulated with the idea that the ROTC was to continue at the size which had been determined and announced. This will merely add one more difficult problem for the colleges, which are already harassed by the multitude of problems attendant upon reconversion to peacetime status. Nor would the curtailment of the program fail to work great hardships upon many of the individual trainees, who had rightly formulated plans for their education on the assumption that they were to have the opportunity to continue through the program which the Navy had outlined. If now, after having progressed part way through that program, they are obliged to reorient themselves to a program of purely civilian education, the readjustment will be most difficult.

Secondly, and of greater significance, the reduction of the program will result in a double injury to the Navy. Not only will there be an interruption to the orderly program of officer procurement upon which the effectiveness of the postwar Navy will so largely depend, but there will follow beyond any doubt a definite injury to the prestige of the Navy, which rightly or wrongly will be accused of having failed to live up to its moral

obligations toward the trainees in its program and toward the educational institutions which have cooperated with it.

In the third place—and this is as important a consideration as any—it seems to me that the reduction of the NROTC program will constitute a blow to a rapidly disintegrating national morale. And it is needless to point out that any blow at the national morale has its repercussions in diminishing national strength and thus diminishing American influence in international affairs. On the other hand, the articulation of plans for an expanded postwar ROTC will convey a definite assurance that we mean to implement an adequate postwar Navy and will, therefore, sound a badly needed note of firmness and orderly approach to the problems of the future.

It is true that I have argued for delay in adopting universal military service for young men. I think that the subject is in great confusion and that it is only a part of a larger picture, namely, completely adequate national defense backed by national morale. But I have no doubts whatever as to the advisability and wisdom of continuing selective service until we know what we shall need. I can see no way by which our national influence can count for anything toward the building of the sort of world in which we want to live if we continue to withdraw from our obligations and to reduce our military strength as we are. To the continuance of selective service I would link strong Reserve officer training programs for both the Army and the Navy.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD DODDS.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BILBO, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3995) to extend the provisions of the act of July 14, 1945, providing for an adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, to pilots and marine engineers of the Fire Department, reported it without amendment.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PEARL HARBOR INVESTIGATION HEARING

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Printing, I ask unanimous consent to report without amendment Senate Concurrent Resolution 43, submitted by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] on December 11, 1945, and request unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 43) was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Joint Congressional Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 5,000 additional copies of each part of the hearings held before said joint committee during the Seventy-ninth Congress, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, a concurrent resolution to investigate the attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, and events and circumstances relating thereto.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

S. 1685. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Paul Dudick (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 1686. A bill to amend title III of the Social Security Act, as amended; and

S. 1687. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to extend title V thereof to the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McFARLAND (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN):

S. 1688. A bill reauthorizing the Gila Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER:

S. 1689. A bill for the relief of William H. Cooper; to the Committee on Claims.

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES—AMENDMENT

Mr. DOWNEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1415) to increase the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

INVESTIGATION CONCERNING MATTERS RELATING TO GOVERNMENT-OWNED LUMBER

Mr. BUSHFIELD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 204), which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

Resolved, That a special committee of seven Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of the amount of lumber available in the hands of any executive department, independent establishment or agency in the executive branch of the Government; the places where and the conditions under which such lumber is stored; the amount of such lumber which can be economically disposed of in the domestic market; and such other matters relating to the handling and disposition of surplus lumber as the committee deems advisable. The committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations for any necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-ninth Congress, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

THE NAVAL DEMOBILIZATION PROGRAM TO DATE

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate received a report yesterday from the

Navy Department in regard to the demobilization program to date. I ask that the information the committee received be printed in the RECORD for the information of the Members of the Congress.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As of December 8, 922,422 personnel had been released from the Navy in less than 4 months since VJ-day. This means that the demobilization job is over one-fourth done. By the end of the calendar year approximately 1,200,000 personnel will have been released and by the end of January the job of demobilization will be half done. The entire demobilization program will be completed prior to September 1, 1946.

The critical scores for the release of personnel have been reduced just as rapidly as the men can be spared from operational requirements. On the 21st of November a further reduction in the point scores was announced effective December 1, December 15, and January 1, to 38, 37, and 36 for male enlisted personnel, and 24 on December 1, and 23 on January 1 for female enlisted personnel.

These scores apply to the bulk of the personnel in the Navy, except for certain critical rates in which the lack of replacements has made it necessary to maintain somewhat higher scores for people in those rates. These include storekeepers, transportation specialists, yeomen, and other similar rates essential to the demobilization process itself, and rates such as the watertenders and machinist mates, which are absolutely essential if the Navy is to continue to operate the ships in the fleet and those engaged in transporting men home. Every step is being taken to find and train replacements for these people and their scores will be brought down to the general scores at the earliest possible moment.

The basic system of demobilization remains as it was, relying primarily upon the point system, supplemented by the provisions for individual hardship cases. The only new development in this respect has been that on December 4 it was announced that men over 38 years of age with dependents will be considered to have a hardship case and will be released upon their application to their commanding officers. Of the approximately 35,000 enlisted men in this category, somewhat over half were already eligible for discharge under the point system, and this provision will make the balance eligible for release upon their application.

The Navy hopes they will be able to reduce the critical scores for the release of personnel still further after the first of the year, although the exact amount of these reductions is not now known.

The controlling factors on the speed of demobilization continue to be the numbers who can be spared and the facilities to bring them home. The Navy has responsibilities which must be discharged. These consist primarily of the support and supply of occupation troops in the Pacific, the roll-up and disposition of the valuable material and equipment in the Pacific, and—equally important—a major share of the responsibility for bringing home to this country the personnel of all the armed services. In order to discharge this last responsibility as rapidly as possible, all available combatant ships which are capable of carrying any sizeable number of passengers have been or are being assigned to transport service. These include in the Pacific service 217 transports, 16 hospital ships, 77 aircraft carriers, 8 aircraft tenders, 26 cruisers, and 6 battleships. The bulk of these combatant vessels are now in the transportation service and the balance will be so operating just as rapidly as they can be provided with the necessary reconversion or additional facilities.

As a measure of the over-all size of this task the joint Army and Navy transportation program requires the return of personnel at the rate of 867,000 men a month.

It is still the program of the Navy to return to civilian life just as rapidly as possible all of the nearly 3,000,000 men and women who are scheduled for demobilization. The Navy's plans call for the completion of demobilization by September 1, 1946, at which time the Navy will be down to its anticipated peacetime strength of 500,000 men and 58,000 officers.

NAVAL DEMOBILIZATION IN THE MEDICAL CORPS

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, on December 11, 1945, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] submitted Senate Resolution 200 and had it referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs. The resolution, among other things, requested information with reference to the naval program of demobilization in the Medical Corps.

The information given the Committee on Naval Affairs at a recent meeting with respect to the demobilization of doctors in the Navy is as follows:

On January 1, 1945, there were some 12,845 doctors enrolled in the naval service. No one, of course, could foresee in January 1945 that the war would end in the following August, and the Navy continued to procure doctors to meet its needs and to insure adequate medical care for the then-expanding Navy and for the anticipated casualties which could be expected from the then-planned invasions in the Pacific. As a result of this recruiting program, the Navy reached its peak in the number of doctors at approximately the time of VJ-day. As of VJ-day, there were in the naval service 14,216 doctors which consisted of 1,952 doctors of the Regular Navy and 12,264 Reserves, including 536 interns. That is the peak from which the Navy started its demobilization program.

Under the existing point scores approximately 5,500 doctors will be eligible for release by the end of the year, or approximately 45 percent of the Reserve doctors in the service on VJ-day. Of that number it is estimated that by the end of the year 4,000 of these will actually have been released or be on their way to separation centers for release. As of December 10, there were approximately 3,094 doctors who had actually been released or were under orders to separation centers for release. The release of doctors has only recently begun to hit its stride as indicated by the fact that while releases to date have totaled 1,290, there are an additional 1,799 of the doctors now technically in the service who are already under orders to separation centers for release. This number will be increased so that by the end of the year approximately 4,000 doctors will be released or under orders to separation centers. It is expected that 1,583 Reserve doctors will be released in January 1946, and 583 in February.

It is essential to keep an adequate number of doctors in the naval service during the demobilization period. In the first place, there are some 69,000 patients in naval hospitals within the continental United States who require medical care. There are in addition between 8,000 and 9,000 persons under

treatment in hospitals outside the United States. These are for the most part patients currently requiring treatment because of illness rather than battle casualties, the bulk of whom have been brought back to this country. These likewise require proper medical care. The ships bringing the men home must have aboard competent doctors, particularly in view of the crowded conditions on the ships and the increased danger of epidemics if proper medical care is not available. The demobilization process itself in this country requires in excess of 1,000 doctors to carry out the program of giving to each man as he leaves the service, the type of physical examination which will protect both him and the Government. Not only must the Government be protected against false claims in the future, but the men themselves should know of any condition existing which justifies medical attention now or in the future.

On September 1, 1945, the ratio of Navy doctors to Navy and Marine Corps personnel was 1 to 274 as compared with an Army ratio on that date of 1 doctor for every 175 persons. The Navy Department expects to maintain this approximate ratio of 1 to 274 until the end of demobilization.

Mr. President, the committee, proposes, therefore, to hold the resolution in the committee for the present and to continue to study the demobilization in the Medical Corps of the Navy along with its study of the general demobilization program.

GEN. GEORGE S. PATTON, JR.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, all America has been cheered to hear the good news that Gen. George Smith Patton, Jr., our greatest field commander in World War II, has battled death to a standstill, and is on his way to making a breakthrough to health.

While we know that Georgie Patton's military career as we have known it in the past is probably through, yet we feel certain that, in spite of his injuries, Georgie Patton will continue in his own way to fight for constitutional Americanism so long as he draws the sweet breath of life; and may that be for a long time to come.

All America says, "Get well, Georgie, and come home soon. We want you near us and with us." But there is a more meaningful way of sending our greetings to Georgie Patton for his rapid and complete recovery.

That is why I should like to make the following suggestion, as follows: I suggest that President Truman nominate this great hero who now holds the permanent two-star rank of major general in the Army, and the temporary rank of four-star general, be promoted to the permanent three-star rank of lieutenant general. If a law is necessary to accomplish this, then let us pass a law.

Anyone who has followed the developments in the Pearl Harbor inquiry and the policy of military promotions throughout the war, knows that in quite a few instances "seven-day wonders" and "swivel-chair generals" have been promoted to very high ranks. Here, however, in Georgie Patton, is a man of 41

years of active military service, a man with 23 proud decorations including every great American decoration except the Congressional Medal of Honor, an undisputed military genius, one of the three greatest American heroes of the Second World War, the others, of course, being Generals Eisenhower and MacArthur, who holds the permanent rank of only major general at this time.

I suggest four reasons then why General Patton should be given this fitting honor now.

First. He himself as an individual deserves it.

Consider, for a brief moment, Georgie Patton's great military record in this war alone. He commanded our landing forces at Casablanca in north Africa. He routed Rommel after the retreat at Casserine Pass. He invaded Sicily and enveloped the foe.

He landed in France on the Fourth of July, was held with his Third Army under wraps until August 1, and then, in the next 9 months and 8 days went 1,400 miles against a mighty foe completely across France into south Germany. By May 9, 1945, the day of the German surrender, he had gone into Austria and Czechoslovakia.

The total losses from all causes sustained by the Third Army in Europe were 139,000 men. But that Army inflicted 1,811,000 casualties on the enemy, an unmatched victorious record of 13 to 1, the greatest record of conserving American life.

Second. Such an honor would serve as an inspiration to the Georgie Pattons who are to come; the courageous men who will follow in his wake as "soldier's soldiers"; the men devoted to a career in the military service of their nation.

Third. Such an honor would serve to rebuke that motley Leftist gang which has been sniping at General Patton and attempting to smear him; the same crew that has been trying to defame General MacArthur, because both of these men represent the very highest in American ideals.

To confer this well-deserved honor on Georgie Patton would be to show these defamers, that their smear attempt has not worked with the American people and the American Congress; to show these domestic followers of what might be called Red fascism that America intends to stand by the men who stand by constitutional Americanism.

Fourth. There is a last reason why I feel this step should be taken. This is the season of Christmas. George Patton is on his back in a foreign land; Patton, the Son of Battle; Patton, the Invincible. This honor to him at this time might well make the difference between life and death. We should send him this appropriate Christmas greeting, this salutation from the heart of 140,000,000 Americans.

I have called him Son of Battle. We pray God that in the future, peace will remain a constant blessing to America and to the world. But if war comes, we need men like Patton, the lionhearted, the man who fights battles, not simply plans them, but the man who executes them; the man who inspires men to do

the impossible and makes them unbeatable.

Almost a year has elapsed now since Ike said to Patton on December 19, 1944, "Start 100 miles north and break that threat in the bulge." We all know that Patton did just that. He wheeled about, smashed through the south side of the bulge, relieved the heroic besieged One Hundred and First Airborne Division at Bastogne and so impacted Von Rundstedt's line as to make the foe reel and stagger and finally retreat.

So let us now at this Christmas season send this Son of Battle of ours a greeting from the President and the Senate of the United States, making him a permanent lieutenant general.

I make this suggestion, therefore, at this time to President Truman.

CITATION TO ACCOMPANY THE AWARD OF THE MEDAL FOR MERIT TO RALPH K. DAVIES

[Mr. CONNALLY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record the citation to accompany the award of the Medal for Merit to Ralph K. Davies, which appears in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Hayden	O'Daniel
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Bankhead	Hill	Pepper
Barkley	Hoey	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Huffman	Reed
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Bushfield	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Byrd	Knowland	Shipstead
Capper	La Follette	Smith
Chavez	Langer	Taylor
Connally	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McClellan	Tobey
Dwney	McFarland	Tunnell
Eastland	McKellar	Tydings
Ellender	McMahon	Vandenberg
Fulbright	Maybank	Wagner
George	Mead	Walsh
Gerry	Millikin	White
Gossett	Mitchell	Wiley
Green	Moore	Willis
Gurney	Morse	Wilson
Hart	Murdock	Young
Hawkes	Murray	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY and Mr. MYERS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is detained at a conference being held at the White House.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are detained on official business at Government departments.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANFILL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent due to the necessity for special treatment for his recent injury.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1946

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] if he will yield to me for the purpose of taking up the deficiency appropriation bill. As the Senator knows, that bill has been before the committee for weeks—I have forgotten exactly how many, but five or six, as I recall—and much work has been done on the bill. We hope to get away next week. I trust the Senator from California will agree that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside for the purpose I have indicated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I shall not make any objection. I simply wish to say that I have heretofore agreed that the Federal pay bill which is now before the Senate may be laid aside. I am very conscious of the heavy responsibilities the acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee carries on his shoulders. I feel I should yield, and I am very happy to do so.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4805) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered. I also ask Senators to watch carefully as the amendments are taken up, and I suggest that all controversial matters be postponed until later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the amendments of the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—General appropriations—Legislative," on page 2, after line 2, to insert:

SENATE

For payment to Minnie McN. Johnson, widow of Hiram W. Johnson, late a Senator from the State of California, \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 6, to insert:

For payment to Mary T. Peavey, daughter of John Thomas, late a Senator from the State of Idaho, \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 8, to insert:

There shall be paid to each Senator, after January 1, 1946, an expense allowance of \$2,500 per annum to assist in defraying expenses related to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, to be paid in equal monthly installments. For making such payments through June 30, 1946, \$120,000.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I do not think this amendment should be agreed to without the Senate realizing what is proposed to be done. This is a proposal to give to each Senator \$2,500 to assist in defraying expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, to be paid in equal monthly installments.

Mr. President, it had been my hope that the entire question of salaries, expenses, and retirement might be deferred until such time as the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress had an opportunity to report. Since the Senate rejected this proposal when it first came before us, I felt that the matter ought not to be disposed of without there being an understanding of exactly what was contemplated.

So far as I am personally concerned I am sure every Senator knows that I am not pleading in behalf of the dignity or jurisdiction of the Committee on Organization. I did have the feeling—and I shall be entirely frank about it—that there would be a better opportunity for a complete consideration of the problems, which I think are interrelated, namely, the questions of salary, retirement, and proper deductions of expenses directly and legitimately connected with the discharge of the duties and responsibilities of the offices of, respectively, Representative and Senator, and that they might be better considered if the whole matter could be taken up de novo.

While I know that there is much force in the argument that the House has provided this amount for its membership, and therefore the Senate should not be left in a different position, I frankly had the feeling that if we left the situation just as it is, the House having appropriated this expense accounts for its Members, and the Senate not having done so for its Members, it might be very helpful in getting the entire problem and all its interrelated factors considered at one time.

I hope the able chairman of the committee will pardon me for having made this statement, but I wanted my own

position in the matter to appear in the Record. I reemphasize that the Senator knows me well enough to realize that I am not standing on the jurisdiction of the Organization Committee, because clearly the ultimate legislative jurisdiction lies with the Appropriations Committee or some other committee of the Congress. But I was rather pleased at the outcome of the situation last spring, because I felt that, in a way, it resulted in what might be said to be an anomalous condition that would be helpful in getting a full and balanced consideration of the problems of salary, retirement and appropriate and legitimate deductions for expenses in connection with the discharge of the duties of the senatorial office.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I think it is proper to make a statement in this connection. Apparently the view of Senators was that, the House having increased the compensation of its Members, Members of the Senate should be placed on a parity with Members of the House. Let me say to the Senator from Wisconsin and to other Senators that, as I recall, both in the subcommittee and in the full committee, the vote was unanimous, with one exception. I voted against the proposal, but I was so overwhelmingly overruled that I feel there is nothing to do but to go along and let the provision become law. For that reason I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Has Congress enacted any basic law authorizing the payment of these expenses, or an appropriation to pay them?

Mr. McKELLAR. There is no law, but last year such a provision was held to be in order in the House. The two Houses have the power, of course, to fix the salaries of their own Members.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It has been stated that this sum would be tax-exempt. That statement was made with reference to the payment made to House Members under the provisions of the bill which was passed earlier this year.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think it would be tax-exempt. I do not know what the authorities have held, but it seems to me that it would not be tax-exempt.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Office of the Collector of Internal Revenue informed me that it would not be tax-exempt. That is what he told Members of the House, and for this reason I shall vote for it.

Mr. McKELLAR. That was my understanding. I have always heard that it was not tax-exempt.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The item is designated in the bill as expenses, and not as salary. If it is for expenses, and if that is the purpose of it, and it is not simply an increase in salary, why would not any expense which a Senator actually incurred be a proper deduction from his income tax? The item is designated as

an expense allowance. If it is used for expenses, it strikes me that it should be exempt from taxation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me say to the Senator that during the rather long time I have been a Member of Congress I have had a great many expenses, and I have never been given any tax exemption on the salary which I have received. I do not believe that this item would be tax-exempt. I believe that the Bureau of Internal Revenue has held that it was not tax-exempt, so far as Members of the House were concerned.

Mr. McCLELLAN. My principal objection is that we are terming it "an expense allowance." The truth is that we are increasing our salaries in the amount of \$2,500, and every Senator knows it, and we ought to say so and call it salary, and not expenses.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I would support the amendment and vote for it if the reference to expenses were eliminated and it were termed an increase in salary. To me it seems to be a subterfuge. In fact, we are increasing our salaries to that extent. I think we are entitled to such an increase, and probably more; but I would much prefer to vote for a salary increase rather than for an expense allowance, if it is to be subject to taxation. If it is for expenses, it ought to be exempt from taxation. If it is not for expenses, but is an increase in salary we ought to say so, and vote for a salary increase that, of course, will be subject to income taxes. That is the objection I have to the amendment. It goes under the guise of expenses when, in truth, we all know, and I think every one else in the country will know, that it is simply an increase in salary, and the Senate ought to say that it is salary and not expenses.

Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. WILLIS, and Mr. ROBERTSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will yield first to the Senator from California, and then to the Senator from Indiana. Before doing so, let me say that this amendment was offered by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and it received the approval of the overwhelming majority of the Appropriations Committee—all except one member. Under those circumstances it seems to me that there is nothing to do but submit it to the Senate and let the Senate vote on it.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield first to the Senator from California.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, there are 96 Senators, and each of us inhabits a different world, where different conditions prevail. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] that, so far as I am concerned, the allowance of approximately \$200 a month would be an allowance purely and solely for expenses. Since I have been a Member of the Senate there has not been a single month when my traveling expenses, extra clerk hire,

taxicab, telephone, and telegraph expenses have not exceeded that sum. Mine may not be a typical case. Up until the time when my poverty compelled me to give up my California home, I was put to an expense of between \$100 to \$150 a month, at the very minimum, in providing for my California home, that being an extraordinary expense. Also, the allowance for travel has hardly been sufficient to pay the cost of transporting across the continent my wife and children, and the furniture, and other items which I have had to have transported.

This is a condition which is so ridiculous that it can hardly be described. The Collector of Internal Revenue refused to allow me to deduct from my income-tax return the extra amount which I was compelled to pay to hire additional clerks to do the work of Uncle Sam. That position was taken because, said the Bureau, "We assume that Senators would have judgment enough to allow themselves all the money they need for clerk hire or traveling expenses, taxicabs, and other expenses; and since such an allowance is not made, we must assume that they are not official expenses."

So far as the Senator from California is concerned, he certainly will be able to present to the tax-collecting authorities a statement of official expenses totaling at least \$200 a month; and I take it that under those conditions official expenses would be deductible, although, of course, the amount stated in the amendment would not be deductible, but would have to be accounted for as income.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I promised to yield to the Senator from Indiana, which I now do.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I was not present at the meeting of the Appropriations Committee when this item was passed on. For some reason, notice of the meeting did not reach me. I believe the meeting was held on rather short notice. If I had been present at that meeting, I would have voted against this proposal. I would have joined with the Senator from Tennessee, who voted against it.

Mr. President, I feel that we are very inconsistent in trying to adopt this proposal at this time. We have already passed on this item at this session of the Congress, within a few months; and it seems to me that it is very inconsistent for us to bring it up at this time.

The second point is that only this week, when the senior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] desired to include in the pay bill an increase in the salaries of Members of Congress, an informal poll was taken, and a majority of Senators expressed their opposition to including such an item in the bill. The reason why they did so was that they felt that at this time, when the problem of wages in private industry is a very critical question between labor and industry, it would be inconsistent for us, as Members of the lawmaking body of our country, to take a stand on the question and further complicate the problem. Therefore, I feel that we are wholly inconsistent in considering such a proposal at this time.

I agree with the Senator from Arkansas that this is really a salary increase. Let us say so. So far as the amount being exempt from Federal income tax is concerned, I believe that, as a matter of justice, we should have an allowance to take care of the additional expenses incurred in maintaining our offices and residences in Washington while we have our permanent homes in the States. But that is not the problem here. I think we are very inconsistent in considering the proposal at this time, and I wish to express my disapproval of it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, in response to the statements which have been made by the very able Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] I merely wish to state that I have had similar experiences with reference to the problems of meeting extraordinary expenses which were occasioned by the necessity of living in Washington and performing the duties of my office. Like the Senator from California, I, too, had to give up my home in my State because I positively could not maintain two homes on the salary which I am receiving. But my contention is that if we appropriate money in order to meet our actual expenses incident to our services in Washington as representatives of the people, it should be subject to deduction if actually used for that purpose. We should not have to pay an income tax on money spent in connection with actual expenses incident to our office. If the purpose of the proposal is to increase our income while at the same time requiring that we shall pay an income tax on it, I think we should increase our salaries sufficiently to take care of our extraordinary expenses and call it salary. If we are to be subjected to these extraordinary expenses and feel that it is necessary to appropriate a special allowance in order to take care of them, such allowance should not be taxable as income.

But, Mr. President, in my opinion the proper way to resolve this problem is simply to increase our salaries a reasonable amount, call it salary and pay tax on it and not resort to this kind of subterfuge.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I thoroughly agree with what has been stated by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], by the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], and by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. This is not an item for meeting expenses; it is an increase in salary. The Bureau of Internal Revenue has made it very clear that its interpretation of the word "home" as applied to a Senator of the United States, is that his home is in the city of Washington. So long as that is the interpretation of the Internal Revenue Bureau, no deduction is allowed for any amount, no matter what Senators might vote themselves in the way of salaries. I am opposed to the proposal because it is purely and simply an increase in salary.

Today is the first time that many of us have known anything about the item.

I am opposed to it. I ask for the yeas and nays on the question, Mr. President.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I am very much in accord with what has been said by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and the other Senators who have spoken. There is no question in the world that something must be done for Senators who sit here and work day and night. Something should be done so that all Senators can make both ends meet, and live respectably. But I have been one of those who have felt that this subject should be taken up in its entirety and not part by part by making a loud noise about a little something here and there. I believe the whole question of the compensation and expenses of Senators should be carefully reviewed. We should know what we are doing. I think we should determine to take up this subject shortly after we convene next year, and grant whatever relief is proper and wise in connection with the services rendered and the necessities involved.

I thought that I might read from a memorandum which I hold in my hand which indicates the salaries paid to Senators and Representatives from the time our Government was established.

The compensation of Senators and Representatives up to 1816 was \$6 a day. It was increased to \$1,500 a year shortly thereafter.

In 1856 the salary was increased to \$3,000 a year. In 1866 it was increased to \$5,000 a year. In 1873 it was made \$7,500 a year. Then apparently some one objected, and the salaries were reduced in 1874 to \$5,000 a year. That may have been due to a reduction in the increased cost of living following the Civil War, so that it was felt justifiable to reduce the salaries to \$5,000 a year.

In 1907 the salaries were increased again to \$7,500 a year and they remained at that figure until 1925, when they were increased to \$10,000 a year.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I think the cataloging should be completed. In 1930, I believe, the salary was not \$10,000 a year.

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the Senator for his correction. I do not have that information on my memorandum.

But, Mr. President, what I have said gives a general idea of how the salaries have ranged since the Government was founded.

I feel very much the same as the Senator from Arkansas has expressed himself. If we are going to grant and justify an expense account it should be so defined by law that there can be no question as to whether it is taxable or not taxable. All expenses associated with industry, such as expenses of traveling salesmen and officers of the company, are nontaxable, provided that they are within reason. The present language of the bill does not define expenses. I understand that there is no definition supplied in connection with a Senator or a Representative. I believe the definition should be written into the law so that there can be no question as to whether such expenses are deductible or taxable.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, let me inquire if a definition that the home of a Senator or Representative must be considered as being in the State from which he comes cure the situation?

Mr. HAWKES. It seems to me that it would help to cure the situation, but I feel very strongly as does the Senator from California. I can tell Senators that for the one item of coming to Washington from New Jersey and returning—New Jersey is a close-by State, and I take my wife back and forth, which entails a proper expense—my expenses for railroad fare and food on the train is nearly \$2,400 a year. I feel that I must return home to New Jersey occasionally because the constituents in a close-by State expect their Senators to return home often.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They do in all States.

Mr. HAWKES. I receive demands every week to return home.

Mr. President, I do not wish to be misunderstood. I am heartily in favor of the salaries of Senators and Representatives being increased to a point which will enable Senators and Representatives to live decently and respectably, and perform their duties without worry and care. But I feel very strongly that, inasmuch as we took the action which we took a few months ago, and inasmuch as only a few days ago the Senator from California withdrew an amendment dealing with the question of increasing the salaries of Senators, now is not the time to increase them. I am convinced that we should thoroughly study our own needs, become familiar with the situation, and return here with a sound recommendation with which we may face the people without fear of them believing that we are trying to mulct the Government, but that instead, we are trying to provide decent compensation and expenses for the representatives of the people.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in the committee I offered the amendment. In answer to some of the statements which Senators have made, I simply wish to say that the amendment is not inconsistent. It is consistent. There is no inconsistency about it. This proposal was not first made by the Senate. It was made by the House of Representatives. Let me point out that the House not only made the proposal and adopted it last June, the House also made the payments retroactive to the 1st of January 1945. So the Members of the House were paid the additional allowance of \$2,500 for the full year. This will certainly make more consistent the position between the Senate and the House.

The amendment is simply an attempt to make the Members of the Senate equal to that of Members of the House of Representatives, on an expense basis. The amendment is in no way inconsistent. I offered it. I joined in offering it before. I have offered it now, and I am again telling the Senate that if the Senate is to degenerate into a millionaires' club, it will be a sorry day for America.

Therefore, Mr. President, in the interest of being able to keep in the Senate a cross-section of America, which it should be, and to have some Senators who are rich, some who are poor, and some whose incomes are moderate, I offered the amendment, and I say that it is sound to have the House of Representatives and the Senate placed on an equal basis.

After we adopt this amendment, if the House of Representatives states that it is ready to repeal the provision, insofar as it is concerned, or if hereafter a major adjustment is made in the salaries of Members of Congress, certainly I shall be open-minded in regard to repeal of the amendment on such a basis. This was considered by the Appropriations Committee last night. The committee voted it out. People have known about it.

Last June I heard Senators stand on this floor and say how terrible it was that the House of Representatives had taken such action and that there would be a great public hue and cry—that the public would rise up and protest against this action by the House. However, when I left here and traveled around the State and country, I found that people said to me, "Why, I supposed, of course, that your expenses were paid—that when you went from Washington to New Hampshire to make a speech or to participate in an official conference your expenses were paid. Why, of course, we thought they were paid. We thought all expenses of Senators and Congressmen were paid."

Mr. President, people have an entire misconception of what a Senator or a Member of the House of Representatives receives in the way of salary. I am glad the Members of the House had the courage and foresight to make such a provision for themselves, and now I am merely trying to have a similar provision made for Members of the Senate, so that the treatment received by Senators will be equal to that received by Members of the House of Representatives.

I hope that if we adopt the amendment now Senators who object to it will have the good taste not to accept the allowance involved.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to ask a question of the Senator regarding the exemption. What would be the effect of the addition of the following language:

There shall be paid to each Senator, whose home for tax purposes shall be considered the State he represents,

Mr. BRIDGES. I think that would strengthen the amendment. I would welcome the addition. I proposed the amendment in the form in which it was proposed in the House. I did not try to change it from the House version. But I think the suggestion the Senator has made probably would settle the argument which has been going on, and would strengthen the provision. Personally, I would favor it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It seems to me that to have a tax on an allowance of \$2,500 for people who are serving the Government and are away from home is a most discriminatory and absolutely improper procedure. It has irritated me ever since I heard of it. I should like to have the Senator include that language in the amendment.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I wish to say a word about the situation. In normal circumstances, and generally, I am in complete harmony with the views expressed by the Senator from Wisconsin. I am quite content to have determination of the proper amount of salaries of Members of Congress and determination of the question of retirement for Members of Congress await a report from the committee of which the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin is the chairman.

But here we are confronted with a situation for which I think there can be no possible justification. The Senate and the House of Representatives are supposed to be coordinate branches of the Congress of the United States; and yet by action taken by the House of Representatives and acquiesced in by the Senate, the Members of the House of Representatives have been accorded an advantage, a preference, a benefit to the extent of \$2,500 a year more than is accorded to Members of the Senate of the United States. I resent that situation. I am quite ready to brush aside all technical questions, all questions of procedure, and to move directly and instantly to the restoring of the equality which the Senate should enjoy with the House of Representatives in the matter of salaries or in the matter of allowances for expenses, whichever the proposal may be.

The objections to the amendment remind me of something which happened some years ago when I was a Member of the House of Representatives. A merchant marine bill was pending before the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and various witnesses would come before the committee and would pound their chests and tell of their love of the American ship and the American merchant marine, they would state that they wanted American ships to be on every sea and to be in every port of the world, with the flag of America at the masthead, and carrying the commerce of America to the people and markets of the world. But then from all sides criticisms and objections would be directed to this feature and that of the proposed legislation, notwithstanding all the encomiums which the general purposes of the measure had received.

After one meeting, Mr. Lasker, who then was Chairman of the Shipping Board, came into my office and said he never had undergone an experience quite like his recent one before the committee. He said the nearest to it occurred when he was appointed to a committee, in Chicago, to solicit funds for some Jewish relief; and he was assigned to canvass a certain section of the city with which he was not particularly familiar, so he was given a guide. As he would come to a particular store, his guide would tell him the business which was conducted in the store and would also tell him what

should be contributed by the owners or managers of the store.

He said that finally, as he was about to enter a certain store, the guide said to him, "There are a couple of brothers here, and they are pretty well to do. They can give plenty if they will, but they are pretty tight, and you will have to work on them." Lasker said he went into the store and met a man who turned out to be the older brother. What happened was substantially as follows: Lasker asked the man for a contribution, but he said, "No; I cannot." Lasker then asked why he could not contribute, and the man said, "Well, my old mother is over in Warsaw, and I have to send her money regularly; and my wife is sick and in a hospital here in Chicago, and the hospital bills are simply terrifying in their amount and frequency." When he was further pressed to make a contribution, the man said, "I have a daughter in one of the fancy finishing schools in the East, and the authorities of the school seem to devote their entire time to offering justification for this charge or that charge or some other charge, and the total of the charges is positively staggering. So I simply cannot give you anything." At that point the door opened and another man entered. He turned out to be the younger brother. Lasker asked him for a contribution, but the younger brother said, "No." Then Lasker said, "Come on, now; you know you can contribute something if you want to." But the man said, "No; I cannot do it." Then Lasker called his attention to the fact that he was not supporting his mother, he did not have a wife in a hospital, he did not have a daughter in one of the fancy finishing schools in the East, and all it would mean if he made a contribution of a couple of hundred dollars would be that he would have only that much less to spend on his lady friends in Chicago. But still the man refused to contribute. Lasker finally turned to him and said, "Will you honestly tell me why you will not contribute?"

The man said, "Yes; I will. It is because I don't like mince pie."

Lasker said, "What does that have to do with whether you will contribute?"

"Well," the man said, "when you ain't going to do a thing anyhow, one excuse is as good as another."

Mr. President, that is the situation here. When some Senators take the position that they simply are not going to vote for this proposal, when they take the position that they will not insist that the Senate of the United States stand on a basis of equality with the House of Representatives, one excuse serves as well as another. Mr. President, the multiplicity of excuses is simply astounding.

I happen to be one of those who hope that the day is not far distant when there will be a salary increase for the Members of the Congress of the United States. I happen to be one of those who hope that the time is coming in the near future when we may draft a retirement law for Members of Congress, recognizing that throughout the whole political life of this Nation retirements are approved, recognizing that throughout industrial America the principle of retirements and

annuities has been constantly expanding, until today what we term modernized industry recognizes and practices the principle.

Mr. President, I hope that we are going to bring the Senate up to an even level with the House of Representatives in this matter. I care not whether it be called salary or expenses or what not. I want equality to be brought about between the House and the Senate, and because this amendment will help in this direction I am for it as reported by the committee.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I merely wish to make a brief statement. I intend to vote against this amendment. I am not going to vote against it for the reason that I do not think there should be an additional salary paid to Members of Congress. I have been for that, and I am for it now; but not in this manner. I have had the opportunity to serve on the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee considering proposed increase in the salaries of Federal judges and that committee, although it has not acted as yet, has, I think, been of the opinion that it would be desirable to have an opportunity to consider an all-around salary bill which would include Members of Congress. I am just as enthusiastic for an increase in the salaries of Members of Congress as, I think, any other Senator; I recognize the justice of it; but I do not want to do it in this way. That is the reason I shall vote against the amendment. Whether that is a sufficient reason in the minds of other Senators or not, that is my position.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I was at the White House with a committee of Senators and missed a portion of the remarks of the Senator from New Hampshire. I should like to ask him if the additional compensation will be tax-exempt.

Mr. BRIDGES. No; it is on the same basis as the additional compensation paid to Members of the House.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am reliably informed it is not tax-exempt, and has been so held by the tax authorities.

Mr. BYRD. Did not the Internal Revenue Bureau give an opinion that under some conditions it is tax-exempt?

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand that the Internal Revenue is of the opinion that it is not tax-exempt.

Mr. BYRD. That is not my understanding.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, a few minutes ago the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] made a statement about that, after calling the internal revenue collector. He said it was not tax-exempt. That statement was made on the floor of the Senate less than 20 minutes ago.

Mr. BYRD. I was not present at the time. I am asking for information.

Mr. BANKHEAD. If it is left to the determination of the public officials in charge of such matters, it is not tax-exempt.

Mr. BYRD. If the fund, when spent for certain expenses, would be tax-exempt, I want to know about it, because I think it is a vital question. I think it a

subterfuge to vote to Senators and Representatives money that is in any way tax-exempt.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I sought an answer from the Bureau of Internal Revenue a few months ago after the House acted. The answer I got was that the House appropriation is tax-exempt insofar as any expenditures would be tax-exempt for any taxpayer receiving expense money. Then, I tried to discover what that meant, and I do not know the answer.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from New Hampshire what expenses does he refer to. The amendment provides that \$2,500 shall be paid to each Senator "to assist in defraying expenses related to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties."

What are those expenses?

Mr. BRIDGES. Senators and Members of the House who live near Washington probably do not have as many expenses as Senators who live some distance away. I think there would be included, for instance, expenses incurred in going to their home State and returning. Members of Congress are allowed expenses for one trip a year, but the average Senator makes many more trips than that. For example, I think last year I made 18 trips to New Hampshire and return. Then, Senators constantly are going to various places to make speeches as a part of their official duties and then they have traveling expenses in connection with attending conferences. Probably the average Senator will make 50 or 60 speeches or participate in that number of meetings in a year. Furthermore, personally, I feel that inasmuch as Senators and Members of the House of Representatives are obliged to maintain homes in their respective States, when they come to Washington the amount of rent they pay here in the District of Columbia should normally be chargeable as an expense, just as in the case of a businessman, a labor leader, or an agricultural leader who visits Washington to present a matter to the Congress or to participate in a conference of some sort. He further pays all his own expenses in or about Washington.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator think that expenses of that character should be deductible?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; they should be deductible, just as the expenses of a businessman are deductible.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator want to establish the principle that all Government employees when they are away from their domiciles should get their living expenses paid when assigned to Washington or some other place?

Mr. BRIDGES. No.

Mr. BYRD. That is what the amendment does in the case of Members of Congress.

Mr. BRIDGES. No. The Senator is aware that Senators and Members of the House must maintain two homes. Each must have a home in his home State or home district or he could never run for Congress, and when he comes to

Washington he must maintain a home here, whether in a hotel, an apartment or in a house. So an elective officer coming to Washington is in a peculiarly different position from that of a person working for the Government and on the Federal pay roll. So my answer to the Senator is by no means do I want to see the principle extended to nonelective officials and employees. I want mere justice. Let us keep the Senate a cross section of America and to do that adequate salaries must be paid and necessary expenses taken care of.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I merely wish to make a brief observation. If the Senate wants to raise its own salaries it ought to do it directly; it ought not to come in the back door instead of the front door. Personally I think that this is a subterfuge. As in fact it is an increase in salary under the classification of expenses and if it is actually for expenses in the conduct of official business it is deductible from the income tax. I said as much when the same question was before the Senate previously. I think it a great mistake to raise salaries in this manner. If the Senate wants to raise the salaries of its Members let it be done directly and not take something in the way of expenses that have never heretofore been considered as expenses and have not been considered as deductible from the income tax. Whatever we do, let it be done in a straightforward manner.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the yeas and nays have been requested and ordered, and the Senator will have an opportunity as will every other Senator to act in a straightforward way.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish merely to make this observation: I voted against this same proposal when it was before the Senate a few months ago. I voted against it because I felt that if there was to be an increase in the salaries of Members of Congress it ought to be made with the understanding that it was an increase of salaries to Members of Congress and that we ought to come in through the front door and tell the American people that that was what we were doing instead of coming through the back door under the guise of an expense account increasing our salaries. Whether it will be tax-exempt or not, so far as I am concerned, is immaterial. When the matter was before the Senate previously we voted to deny it to ourselves, but we did not vote to deny it to the Members of the House of Representatives, and therefore we established a discrimination between the compensation of Members of the Senate and Members of the House which has never before existed in the history of the United States. That, so far as I am concerned, is also immaterial because I voted to deny it to Senators and I also voted to deny it to Members of the House, but the majority was in favor of giving it to Members of the House and denying it to the Senate.

I dare say there is no Member of this body who needs the \$2,500 extra compensation more than I need it; but, Mr. President, I am not willing, under the guise of an expense account, to vote myself \$2,500 a year extra, notwithstanding the fact that Members of the House are

now obtaining it. I have said here and I repeat that I think I would vote for an increase in the salary of Members of Congress if it was presented on its merits and as an increase that the American people could understand, but I would not vote for an increase in the salary of Members of Congress alone. I have said and I repeat that even if it comes up on its merits as a direct increase in the compensation of Members of the Congress, brought in by the front door instead of the back way through the kitchen, I will not vote for it unless and until all Government employees have had their salaries considered and determined upon the basis of justice and equity in a scheme designed to consider all salaries. I mean by that from the President of the United States down through the judiciary, the legislative branch, and all other branches.

I think there would be justification for a readjustment of the salaries of all Government employees. In view of what we know, I think we might well increase either the salary or increase the allowance of the President of the United States. I have a very deep conviction that we should increase judicial salaries, from the Supreme Court all the way down through the Circuit Court of Appeals to the district courts. Whenever an all-inclusive bill is brought before the Senate readjusting the salaries of all departments of our Government, I shall then be prepared to vote for it on its merits, and I think I shall support it, unless I conclude that it is extravagant and unjustified. But I will not vote for an increase in the compensation of Members of the Congress of the United States by themselves, under any pretext, until and unless there is a suitable adjustment in the compensation of all Government employees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee on page 2, beginning with line 9, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, after line 8, it is proposed to insert the following:

There shall be paid to each Senator, after January 1, 1946, an expense allowance of \$2,500 per annum to assist in defraying expenses related to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, to be paid in equal monthly installments. For making such payments through June 30, 1946, \$120,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BANKHEAD (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and permit my vote to stand. If the Senator from Louisiana were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Sen-

ator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY and Mr. MYERS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is detained at a conference being held at the White House.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained on official business at various Government departments.

I wish to announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANFILL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent due to the necessity for special treatment for his recent injury.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is detained in committee meeting.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is necessarily absent. If present, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is absent on official business. If present, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] would vote "nay," if present. His general pair and its transfer have been announced.

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—24

Ball	Gurney	Mitchell
Bankhead	Hayden	Murray
Bridges	Hill	Pepper
Brooks	Hoey	Taylor
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Thomas, Utah
Downey	Kilgore	Tobey
Fulbright	Maybank	Wagner
Green	Mead	White

NAYS—47

Austin	Huffman	Radcliffe
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Bilbo	Knowland	Revercomb
Bushfield	La Follette	Robertson
Byrd	Langer	Saltonstall
Capper	Lucas	Shipstead
Connally	McClellan	Smith
Donnell	McFarland	Tunnell
Eastland	McKellar	Tydings
Ellender	McMahon	Vandenberg
George	Millikin	Walsh
Gerry	Moore	Wiley
Gossett	Morse	Willis
Hart	Murdock	Wilson
Hawkes	O'Daniel	Young
Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney	

NOT VOTING—25

Aiken	Bailey	Briggs
Andrews	Brewster	Buck

Butler	Hatch	Stewart
Capehart	McCarran	Taft
Carville	Magnuson	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	Myers	Wheeler
Ferguson	Overton	Wherry
Glass	Russell	
Guffey	Stanfill	

So the amendment was rejected.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 4129) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

SALE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT-OWNED MERCHANT VESSELS—MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the votes whereby the Senate, on December 12, agreed to the committee amendment, as amended, to House bill 3603, to provide for the sale of surplus war-built vessels, and for other purposes; and to the amendment proposed by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] striking out, on page 32, line 13, the word "dry-cargo."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be filed.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, how did the Senator from Maryland vote on that subject?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, my motion is a privileged one. I simply move to reconsider.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is the Senator from Maryland making a motion to reconsider at this time?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I am filing the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is simply filing the motion.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the Senator from Maryland further yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Would the Senator disclose when he proposes to press his motion to reconsider?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I wish I could answer the Senator from California, but I can simply say at the earliest moment possible. Under the rules of the Senate a motion such as this must be filed within 3 days of the action that was taken, and this is the third day, so I am entering the motion to protect the situation. At the earliest possible moment I shall ask that it be taken up and pressed for action. That will be, I trust, in a day or so.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Can such notice of intention be filed by a Senator who did not vote on the prevailing side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. When no record vote, or yea-and-nay vote is taken, such a motion may be made by any Member. The motion is filed.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1946

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4805) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Alabama that his amendment will not be in order until consideration of committee amendments is concluded.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I should like to have the amendment read so the Senate may understand it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, after line 12, it is proposed to insert the following:

The compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be at the rate of \$13,300 per annum each; and the compensation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Vice President of the United States shall be at the rate of \$19,950 per annum each.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, while we are on this subject I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama. [Putting the question.]

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, is the question on the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. BYRD. I ask for the yeas and nays on that amendment. I think we should have a yea-and-nay vote on it.

Mr. President, I understand the Chair put the question on the amendment. Was the amendment agreed to or rejected?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has not announced the result. The Chair is in doubt as to the result.

Mr. BYRD. Then I withdraw my request for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, before the request for the yeas and nays is granted, I wish to make a brief explanation of the amendment. There seems to be a practically unanimous feeling in the Senate that the present salary situation, particularly with respect to Senators, but also with respect to Members of the House, is not justified, and that it is not in the public interest. I think it can be well said that the statements which have been made by individuals of intelligence in this Nation who have considered the subject, and expressions by various writers and commentators and newspaper editors, indicate that the sentiment is overwhelmingly in support of the plan to increase the

salaries of both Senators and Representatives. While that is true and while I believe there is a predominant sentiment in the Senate in favor of such action, still it seems impossible, for one reason or another, because of objections made on one ground or another, because of excuses of one nature or another—it seems impossible for a majority to agree upon the method of making the increase and, possibly, its amount.

Personally I believe the salary of a Member of Congress should be fixed at at least \$15,000. Some Senators think the salary should not be fixed at so high a figure. Some think, as is shown by the majority leader's statement, that it ought to be contingent upon what increases are made, and when such increases are made, in the salaries of the ordinary employees of the Government.

Mr. President, I do not consider that the congressional salary should be upon the same basis as the salaries of stenographers and other worthy workers in the Government service. The Congress of the United States constitutes the board of directors for the greatest Government in all the world. It is a board of directors handling the expenditure of many billions of dollars. It is a board of directors chosen by the American people, whose duty it is to levy taxes upon such items and in such amounts as will bring revenue into the Treasury in a fair and just way, without undue oppression upon the wealthy or the poor. That, Mr. President, is the most difficult problem that ever confronted an American legislative body. Still there are some who think we ought to have cheap men on that board of directors, men who are willing to perform these duties and assume these responsibilities and carry these burdens at a compensation comparable with that of workers who engage in mental or physical work by the hour, and who have no such burdens and responsibilities as are placed upon this great body of men.

So Mr. President, in the face of the numerous declarations made that this is not the time to do it, that this is not the way to do it, I submit the question: When will there be a suitable time and a suitable way to go on record?

We know the necessity for men in politics, subject to popular elections, to keep an eye upon the time when they will be required to submit their candidacies to the electorate of their States. How many men have we heard say "Well, do not forget my election comes up next year." I have no criticism at all to make of men who take that factor into account. I merely point it out to indicate that ordinarily one-third of the membership of this body have deterring influences to prevent them from a full and free expression of their judgment upon this great business proposition.

Mr. President, I hear it said, as other Senators have heard it said, by some Members of Congress, that we ought not at this time to pass upon the salaries of Members of Congress, because it may have an influence upon the labor situation, upon the question of the amount to be paid industrial workers in the controversies which are now pending. We have heard it said—and we know it is

in the air—that some Members of Congress want the adjustment of this subject, the real settlement of the law and the facts, made after all these labor problems have been settled and gotten out of the way.

Mr. President, there is no connection between the compensation or the salary to be paid to this great body of directors for 135,000,000 people, who handle hundreds of millions of dollars, and a wage dispute between employees and employer. Labor does not seek cheap men to lead and handle their organizations and to adjust their differences with employers. Do Senators hear labor talking about removing a \$25,000 or \$50,000 a year president of the CIO or of the American Federation of Labor, or of any other labor organization, in order to get a cheaper man, to save a little of the salary of the men who are looking after the affairs of the great body of workers? No. In fact, I am advised that the labor organizations approve an increase in the salaries of Members of Congress.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. My problem in connection with this issue is this: I quite agree that there should be an increased level of compensation for Members of Congress, but I cannot escape the feeling that I am under contract with my constituency, that I accepted the contract at \$10,000 a year, and that any increase should be effective only after the intervention of an election.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I appreciate the conscientiousness of the Senator from Michigan, and his desire to observe his obligation. I look upon him as a thoroughly honest man. I like him. But the Senator should know that at least two-thirds of the Senators are not in that position, and he is voting to adjust the salaries of all of us, and not merely his own. If his conscience restrains him until after the intervention of an election, he can settle that question as the late Senator Borah did on one occasion, by simply not receiving the check for the increased amount of the salary. That would fully comply with the personal obligation which he feels, and I do not doubt that he feels it, as it has been stated. But he is helping to hold back a decision which in my judgment the Senator from Michigan realizes ought to be made by the Congress at this time, and without delay.

Many Senators are amply able to serve without any salary. Sometimes I think we ought to establish a system whereby we would serve as dollar-a-year men. We seem to be drifting in that direction. As the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has said, we seem to be drifting in the direction of having rich men predominate in the Senate. Of course, the matter of salary is of no concern to many Members.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. If we are to proceed on the basis of what might be called parity with the whole Federal employee picture, my information is that since 1941

Federal employees have received an increase of approximately 21 percent. Is that figure substantially accurate?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I believe so, subject to correction by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. TYDINGS. Under the Byrd plan, they would receive a still further increase, which would bring them up to an increase of approximately 33 percent as compared with 1941.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is the basis of my amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. So those who argue that Members of Congress should not receive any increase greater than that received by Federal employees have that argument taken away from them under the Senator's plan.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. Likewise, as the Senator has pointed out, the last time the compensation of Members of Congress was increased was in 1925. That was nearly 21 years ago. So if we are to be anywhere near consistent in the position we take, pro or con, we ought not to make one argument at one time, and then use another argument at some other time. We ought to be consistent.

Mr. BANKHEAD. This amendment is offered to meet the issue fairly and squarely.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Let me complete this statement, and then I shall be glad to yield.

It is agreed in the debates by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who is a great economist, and by the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], as I understand, that the average increase in the cost of living since 1941 has been 33 percent. That is the position of the Government in its effort to hold down run-away inflation, and that is the position announced by Judge Collet. Members of Congress have had no increase in their compensation since 1925. I have offered an amendment to adjust the situation directly, not by circumvention, not by any claim that a certain item is tax-exempt or not tax-exempt. My amendment would adjust the compensation of Members of Congress in the same way that the compensation of Federal employees is sought to be adjusted, by increasing our salaries, not to what many of us think they ought to be, but to an extent which would recognize that Federal employees are seeking and are likely to get, an increase of 33 percent. My amendment would provide the same degree of increase in the compensation of Members of Congress.

I now yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the Senator for yielding. I know that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] always wishes to be accurate. The point which he raises is a very good point, but I wish to emphasize the fact that it does not apply to the schedule of the Senator from Virginia, because, beginning with \$5,200, the over-all increase is 21 percent, instead of 33 percent; and when we reach a salary of \$5,600, the total over-all increase is 20.25. At \$6,000 it is 19½ percent. At \$8,500 the percentage is 16.41,

and so forth. I know that the Senator wishes to recognize those facts.

Mr. TYDINGS. I was taking the over-all figure. However, as I understand, in the lower brackets the Senator from Virginia would allow substantially the full increase advocated by the Senator from California.

Mr. BANKHEAD. To those receiving salaries up to \$2,000 a year.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Virginia told me a moment ago that according to his recollection the increase in Federal salaries from 1941 to 1945 was 21 percent.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to make it clear that that is on an over-all basis. The increase in the case of those receiving \$10,000 is \$1,440.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, to be perfectly fair the Senator from New Jersey would have to admit that the average employee of the Government who receives \$8,000, \$9,000, or \$10,000, and who would receive an increase under the proposed legislation, does not have to maintain two homes. He has the advantage of retirement pay when he completes his service. He has no election expenses. He does not have to transport his children from the place where he is appointed to Washington and return. If we wish to be frank about it and face the issue, all kinds of conditions enter into the congressional status which are not incident to any other situation. If a Federal employee is moved by Government order, he is paid a certain allowance for moving expenses.

I am interested in this argument, not primarily from the standpoint of personal aggrandizement for myself or anyone else, but because I believe that there are certain elements of justice which are visible and ought to be faced by the Members of this body. I agree with what the Senator from Alabama has said. One of the worst things that could happen to this body, or the other House, would be to make it a rich man's club. To my personal knowledge many Members of Congress who are provident in their manner of living, have a difficult time making both ends meet and paying their taxes and other expenses. That is not a healthy condition for a Member of a legislative body.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. Let me say to the Senator from Maryland that apparently he was not in the Chamber when I spoke a few moments ago.

Mr. TYDINGS. No; I was not. I was at the White House.

Mr. HAWKES. I wish to be fair. I agree with what the Senator from Alabama has said. The situation must be corrected. But my point is that we have a committee working on the subject and I should like to see a report on it, just as I would want a report in connection with a business which I might be operating. By following that procedure the question can be decided in such a way that later there will not be criticism regarding things forgotten or things

done a second time. I am heartily in accord with what the Senator has said.

Two or three times in this debate emphasis has been placed on the point that we do not wish to make this a rich man's club. No one in the United States is more in accord with that statement than am I.

The Senate should be a place where men of ability, patriotism, honesty, and integrity can be elected to serve their constituents and the people of the United States, to the benefit of all the people. The question of money or lack of it should not be a determining factor.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama further yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think we are making a fundamental mistake if we conceive of the Congress as we conceive of the Federal employment establishment. Senators have no retirement. They cannot pay into a retirement fund. Neither can Members of the House of Representatives. Members of the Congress have no long tenure of office guaranteed on good behavior, because many fine and well-behaved Senators have, for one reason or another, been eliminated from this body. I think this body is cheapened if it is considered on any basis other than that of a body whose Members are elected for a limited period of time.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It is a separate branch of Government.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wished to have the Senator yield to me for a moment so that I could point out that in the Appropriations Committee of this very body this matter was amply considered and discussed. A vote was taken in the committee, and there is on the calendar a bill, with a favorable report which was almost unanimous, advocating an increase to \$15,000 of the salaries of Members of the House of Representatives and Members of the Senate, and an increase for the President, an increase for the Vice President, and an increase for members of the Cabinet. All their positions are of short tenure. There is no relationship between the service they render and the service rendered by those in the classified service of the Federal Government. As I have said, that bill is on the calendar. Naturally, a Member of Congress who will be up for reelection next year, as will all the Members of the House of Representatives and one-third of the Members of the Senate, will be in a very difficult position if he supports any bill for any salary increase for Members of Congress at this time, because it is the mechanism of demagoguery, which happens to be a part of democracy, for an opponent to say, "He voted himself a salary increase." But, Mr. President, under that philosophy, 150 years from now, even if everything else went up 500 or 1,000 percent, the salaries of Members of Congress would be what they are today.

No Member of Congress has received a salary increase since 1925. Yet we have given to the employees in the classified service an increase, in round numbers, of 21 percent. Why, then, if we are going to argue the relationship between

service in Congress and the classified service, should not Senators and Members of the House of Representatives have received increases in their salaries? Since they have received none, and now that the Senator from Alabama has attempted at the last moment to establish some platform of justice, it seems to me that the argument and logic of the case, as proven by the opponents of his amendment, are all on his side. The very arguments made to defeat his proposal were made to defeat the other proposal; but now that the circumstances are reversed the Members who made such arguments have retreated from them.

I think the Senator has made out a good case. I think we should consider it, not from the standpoint of politics, but, in view of all the circumstances, from the standpoint of what is just and fair for the welfare of the country in this emergency.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me, to permit me to ask a question?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. As I understand, the proposal made by the Senator from Maryland and approved by the Appropriations Committee would be effective at the end of this Congress.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; if it passes.

Mr. BYRD. This amendment is to be effective immediately, as I understand.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; because we are not asking for the full \$15,000.

Mr. BYRD. However, I understand that the Appropriations Committee has recommended that the increase to \$15,000 be made at the end of this year.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; and that is the way it should be done.

Mr. BANKHEAD. However, Mr. President, let me point out that I have not heard that the Senator from Virginia is supporting it.

Mr. BYRD. That may be. But I asked the question. Regardless of whether I am going to support it, I am entitled to know the facts.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I trust the Senator will obtain the facts.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I would much prefer to have the proposal taken up as a separate matter and have the increase made effective at the end of the present Congress, rather than now. But my point is that when that matter comes up under its own steam, new arguments will be made and the matter will be laid aside for further study and the present situation will continue to prevail.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Of course, that is what will happen. We all know that it is always easy to find excuses when one is opposed to a certain proposition.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I understand that the proposal is to establish equality of treatment temporarily.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is all it amounts to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is not an attempt permanently to increase the salaries of Members of the Senate, as I understand.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator said he had not heard that the Senator from Virginia was supporting the bill providing that the salaries of Senators shall be \$15,000. The suggestion also was made that in the next election some point might be made if Members of the Congress voted to increase their own salaries. However, I would not be affected by such an argument, because I will not be involved in the next election.

The point I make is that the salaries of Members of Congress should be increased. The Senator from Maryland pointed out why the matter of increasing the salaries of Members of Congress should not be considered simply on the basis of comparison with increases granted to persons in the classified Government service, namely, because there is very definitely a difference between the expenses and the circumstances involved. I take it there is a very definite difference between the position of a person in the classified Government service, however worthy he may be, and the position of a Senator or Member of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States.

I take the position, and I wish to make it plain, that I am ready to support the bill which has been reported by the committee. In order that the record may be straight, I wish to say that I think \$15,000 a year is the minimum salary which Members of Congress should receive, and I think such an increase is justified and we should have the courage to bring up the measure providing for that salary and to vote for it. But Mr. President, I do not want to increase my salary under any guise or pretext that it is expenses.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator. But the trouble is that we simply cannot get a sufficient number of Members to face the music.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The other reason why I wished to make the statement I have made is that I did not wish to leave an inference that I am opposed to having the salaries increased. I wish to make it clear that I am ready to vote for an increase in salaries, and I think the salaries of Members of Congress should be the amount reported by the committee.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am glad the Senator has made that statement, although personally I understood his position. I am glad he has made it for the benefit of other Senators.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Tentatively, Mr. President, I should like to propose, as a substitute for the pending amendment of the Senator from Alabama, the following:

The compensation of the Vice President of the United States and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall be at the rate of \$20,000 per annum, each. The compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be at the rate of \$15,000 per annum, each; and the compensation of heads of the executive departments who are members of

the President's Cabinet shall be at the rate of \$17,500 per annum, each.

Mr. President, that is the proposal which was recommended almost unanimously by the Appropriations Committee, with the proviso that it should not go into effect until January 3, 1947, as I recall. I would much prefer to support the proposal I have just stated rather than the one offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama. The proposal I have just stated would eliminate the nasty implication of Members of Congress voting to increase their own salaries; at least, it would do so as far as we humanly could eliminate it. I would rather see the matter handled in this fashion.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, the Senator knows that I am in favor of his proposal. Of course, I hope he will not complicate the issue at this time.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes, Mr. President; the Senator from Alabama has expressed his approval of this proposal. But after standing by for a long time and seeing no action taken, he has taken the stand he has today.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is correct. Later I shall vote for the bill which has been referred to, and I hope the Senate will take up the entire question and will deal with it broadly and effectively in comprehensive legislation.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] made a most convincing address, one which impressed me very deeply. He is always a clear thinker. He pointed out that we are occupying an anomalous position, a position which really brings the Senate of the United States into disrespect. It subordinates Members of the Senate to the superiority of the House, because in public opinion salaries are paid in large measure according to the ability of the occupants of the office.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Not until I complete my statement, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. President, the Senator from Maine pointed out that the House of Representatives favorably considered this matter. Of course, the House of Representatives is composed of able men. Many of them later become Members of the Senate. Nearly all of them do so at their first opportunity. The House of Representatives adopted the amendment providing for an increase of \$2,500 a year. I have not heard any complaint about it among the people. Some Members of the Senate thought that it would result in a strong protest being made. The only criticism which I have heard is, "Why do not you Members of the Senate have the courage to do the same thing, and keep yourselves on an equal plane with the Members of the House of Representatives? Do you feel inferior to them? Have you lost courage?" The people understand that nearly everyone at the present time is facing the change which has taken place in the standards of living.

Mr. President, it has been said that we may make the Senate a rich man's club, or require Senators to earn additional compensation in order to meet

their necessary obligations while living in Washington. Many of them came from sections of the country where the cost of living is not so high as it is in Washington. It is not in the public interest to force upon them a difference in standards of living without making it possible for them to meet the increased costs. The people who reside in the States who send Representatives to Congress do not obtain the best results by sending a type of man to the Senate, for example, who bids for the office, or a rich man who does not need any salary, or a man who must earn additional compensation by engaging in professional or business transactions.

Mr. President, the Senate has come to be an all-time body. When I first became a Member of the Senate it was approximately a half-time body. The Senate was in session about 6 months at the most during any year. The present salary of a Senator was fixed on that basis before the lame-duck amendment was adopted. The time which a Senator must actually consume in fulfilling his duties as a Member of the United States Senate has gradually increased until now no Member of the Senate can carry on his law practice, his banking business, his insurance business, his real-estate business, or any other kind of a business, and do full justice to the rights of his constituents and other citizens in his State. It has become necessary for him to separate himself from any private business he may have had. I have had to do so, and I know several other Senators who have had to do likewise. It has been necessary to sever all connections with other legitimate means of earning a livelihood which a Senator may have had. It has been necessary to give his constituents all his time and his best thought, as well as the greatest amount of study and research that it is possible for him to give.

Mr. President, I think the people want to pay their Representatives reasonable salaries. They know that officials in industry receive salaries ranging from \$25,000 a year to even as high as \$250,000 a year for conducting the business of only one company. Such salaries are carried into the costs of production, or transportation, or whatever it may be, and passed on down the line to the consuming public. So, after all, the people pay those high salaries. They may not know specifically how it is done, but nevertheless they must pay them. The stockholders are willing that it be done because they want able men to transact the business affairs of their corporations and companies.

Mr. President, let us take for example the Cabinet members and heads of the various governmental departments. I have a long list of Government officials who receive salaries of \$12,000 a year and more. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has a similar list.

Mr. BYRD. I have a list of approximately 10 or 15 such officials.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have a list which is much longer.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a list

of executives and officials of the Government receiving salaries of more than \$10,000 a year.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Salaries of more than \$10,000

Executive Assistant (White House).....	\$12,000
Director, Office of Economic Stabilization.....	15,000
Director, Export-Import Bank.....	15,000
Director, Office of War Information.....	12,000
Administrator, Surplus War Property Administration.....	12,000
10 Cabinet members (each).....	15,000
Comptroller of the Currency.....	15,000
Collector of customs, New York.....	12,000
General manager, Anchorage, Alaska (Department of the Interior), the Alaska Railroad.....	14,400
Federal Security Agency (Director).....	12,000
Administrator, Federal Works Agency (includes pay and allowances for commissioned officer on active list of U. S. Army, etc., p. 271, Official Register of United States).....	12,000
Comptroller General.....	12,000
Chairman and 9 other Commissioners, Interstate Commerce Commission (each).....	12,000
Commissioner, U. S. Maritime Commission.....	12,000
Administrator, National Housing Agency.....	12,000
Commissioner, Office of Federal Housing Administration.....	12,000
Administrator, Office of Price Administration.....	12,000
4 members, U. S. Tariff Commission (each).....	11,000
Administrator, Veterans' Administration.....	12,000
9 Supreme Court Justices (each).....	20,000
2 Chief Justices (each).....	20,500
U. S. Court of Appeals, District of Columbia, 6 judges (each).....	12,500
(1 of above places vacant).....	
3 circuit judges, first circuit (each).....	12,500
6 circuit judges, second circuit (each).....	12,500
5 circuit judges, third circuit (each).....	12,500
3 circuit judges, fourth circuit (each).....	12,500
6 circuit judges, fifth circuit (each).....	12,500
6 circuit judges, sixth circuit (each).....	12,500
5 circuit judges, seventh circuit (each).....	12,500
7 circuit judges, eighth circuit (each).....	12,500
6 circuit judges, ninth circuit (each).....	12,000
4 circuit judges, tenth circuit (each).....	12,500
5 judges, U. S. Court of Claims (each).....	12,500
4 judges and 1 vacancy, U. S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals (each).....	12,500
Total.....	118
Court judges.....	78
Number of Federal employees receiving \$10,000 per annum.....	176
United States district judges receiving \$10,000 per annum.....	101
Customs court judges receiving \$10,000 per annum.....	9

Mr. BANKHEAD. In many instances, in addition to salaries which are higher than the salaries received by Members of Congress, automobiles are supplied.

Mr. BRIDGES. And chauffeurs.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes. In some cases officials are supplied with two or three automobiles, as well as chauffeurs. The automobiles are used in connection with

the transaction of business in Washington. Yesterday the Appropriations Committee considered a request from the Maritime Commission, or the Civil Aeronautics Board, for authority to purchase seven airplanes. Free automobiles do not travel fast enough. Of course, the furnishing of the airplanes would include expenses for pilots.

Mr. BRIDGES. And probably copilots and hostesses.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. The officials who are now furnished with long, sleek limousines and chauffeurs, as many bureaucrats are, would not be satisfied with airplanes unless they were also furnished with pilots, copilots, and good-looking hostesses. [Laughter.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, if the present situation prevails, I believe that the standards of Congress will be lowered. Two things should be considered. One of them is that the tax law giving businessmen the right to deduct expenses incurred in making trips which are necessarily made in connection with the conduct of business, should be repealed.

With reference to the subject of automobiles, does any Senator know how many automobiles are furnished to Government employees? The number runs into thousands. Some time ago the Senate witnessed a debate in which the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] took part, concerning the number of automobiles which should be allowed the TVA. The Senator from Tennessee fought vigorously to have the number reduced.

Mr. McKellar. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. McKellar. As the Senator knows, as the acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee, yesterday I appointed him, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Brooks] to be a committee of three to examine into the number of automobiles now being supplied to Government officials, who has them, how many there are, what the cost is of maintaining them, and everything concerning the subject. I think these matters should be examined, and I am sure the committee will do its duty.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think it is unfortunate we have waited so long as we have waited, and have let them get such a firm grip on a situation of that sort, while we, with power to keep them out of office, we, who are required to pass on the qualifications of every one of them, go around trying to catch a ride, thumbing a ride from time to time in order to get downtown, or to reach our apartments.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The very distinguished Senator from Alabama has always been a man of courage, and he has stood here and voted for what he believed to be right in this matter.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BRIDGES. I wish to ask him whether he can imagine, if the \$2,500

expense account creates this racket in the Senate, what would happen if he should propose that each Senator and Representative should be furnished a long, sleek Packard limousine or Cadillac limousine, with a chauffeur, such as every bureau in Washington has, at least one, and sometimes more?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I would need the detail of a whole regiment of soldiers to get me out of the Senate Chamber, if I seriously made such a proposal.

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. A while ago, in answering a question propounded by the Senator from Arkansas, the Senator from Alabama stated that his proposal would not fix the salaries of Senators and Representatives on a permanent basis.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is true.

Mr. ELLENDER. What is there in the language to indicate that?

Mr. BANKHEAD. This is merely a deficiency appropriation bill, and the appropriations under it run only to June 30.

Mr. ELLENDER. Not according to the copy of the amendment I have. The amendment I have states that "the compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be at the rate of \$13,500 per annum each; the compensation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Vice President of the United States shall be at the rate of \$19,500 each."

Mr. BANKHEAD. I had a proviso in the amendment. I intended to include the words "to June 30." I will amend it now, because this is a deficiency bill, and I have no intention of fixing a permanent program. I think Congress will do its duty and in the regular way deal with the salaries of Members of Congress, as well as other officials, probably. But I do not think we should mix our compensation with that of any other group of employees or officials of the Government. We are legislative, they are executive, and I do not intend to vote to provide for a readjustment of compensation as between Senators and Representatives and other officials.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Certainly.

Mr. ELLENDER. Suppose Congress should adopt the Senator's proposal. Would not the Members of the House of Representatives receive, in addition to the compensation fixed, the \$2,500 extra they are now receiving?

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Members of the House would, of course. We cannot deal with them. I am dealing with the Senate. I have pointed out that it is disgraceful for us to remain in the situation in which we have been, and neglect the whole compensation program so far as the Senate is concerned.

Mr. ELLENDER. So that if Congress should adopt the Senator's proposal a United States Senator would be paid at the rate of \$13,500 a year, and Members of the House \$16,000. Am I correct?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what it would be. The \$2,500 additional now paid Members of the House, plus the \$13,500, would aggregate \$16,000.

Mr. BANKHEAD. If we count the \$2,500 as compensation.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is really salary.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Whatever it may be, that should not deter us for, while Members of Congress are not, of course, on a starvation basis, yet they are on a basis far below what they have heretofore enjoyed socially, economically, and in business.

Mr. President, I do not care to take further time. Every Member of the Senate understands what is involved. They say, "Yes, we should have more pay; we need it; it is in the interest of the people that we should have it, but—" There is always "but, if, and." Some circumstances arise which keep some from going on record. I stated that I would add to the amendment the provision that it should apply through June 30, 1946.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be so modified.

Mr. BANKHEAD. As I have said, I am not trying to go fully into this subject at this time. It would not satisfy me to stop at \$13,500 as permanent compensation. I do not think that is adequate; I do not think it is sufficient. My amendment merely meets the various arguments which have been made, and will put many to the test as to whether the arguments which have been made on this floor are really the result of the convictions of those who have spoken that Members of Congress should have their salaries increased commensurate with the increase in the cost of living. I make it apply for only a time, until Congress can work out a permanent program. It would commit the Senate to the idea that something, at least, must be done. If we cannot agree on anything else, here is a little; we will at least make a start. If we cannot agree on anything else, then we will have this, and perhaps get this much.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. In connection with his very forceful and able address relative to this problem, I think the Senator from Alabama should at this time point out that many very able men in both branches of Congress have to face the prospect of leaving the Congress. There were two very recent examples in the House of Representatives. One was Mr. Woodrum of Virginia, who is one of the very able Members of the House.

Mr. BANKHEAD. He is the ranking Democrat on the great Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BRIDGES. Then there is Mr. Ramspeck, chairman of the Committee on the Civil Service, another very able man.

Mr. BANKHEAD. He is the whip of the majority party, it may be pointed out.

Mr. BRIDGES. Both of them have been forced, as a result of the salary situation, to leave the Congress as of the first of the year, and take positions where they will receive two or three or

four times what they are getting as Members of Congress.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Let me point out one further argument, that the tax on his salary would decrease the amount a Senator would receive, so that he would get but little more than \$11,000. The Government by way of tax would take \$3,000 or more out of the salary fixed. So the Government would not even pay out as much as is provided.

Congressional salaries were fixed back in the old days when Federal salaries were all exempt, when salaries of Members of Congress were exempt. A salary increase to about \$11,000 would be the total effect of the proposed amendment.

Mr. President, earlier in my remarks I stated from memory approximately the amount of money that would be left to a Member of Congress from a salary of \$13,300. I now have the correct figures before me, and I ask that this statement of figures be substituted for what I stated from memory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the Revenue Act of 1945 a Member of Congress with a salary of \$10,000 per annum (claiming himself and wife as exemptions) would have withheld from his salary \$1,604.40, leaving his net salary \$8,395.60. (Tax equals 16 percent of salary.)

With a salary of \$15,000 per annum, he would have withheld \$2,580, leaving his net salary \$12,420. (Tax equals 17.2 percent of salary.)

With a salary of \$13,300 per annum, he would have withheld \$2,256.96, leaving his net salary \$11,043.04. (Tax equals approximately 17 percent of salary.)

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LANGER. What is the pending amendment? May we have it read at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], as modified, will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, after line 12, it is proposed to insert the following:

Up to and including June 30, 1946, the compensation of Senators, Representatives in Congress, Delegates from the Territories, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico shall be at the rate of \$13,300 per annum each; and the compensation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Vice President of the United States shall be at the rate of \$19,950 per annum each.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may I inquire whether that pay increase takes effect immediately, if we adopt the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator repeat his inquiry?

Mr. LANGER. Does the increase in salary, or whatever Senators may choose to call it, take effect immediately after the bill is passed and signed by the President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the 1st of January.

Mr. LANGER. Of next January?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I want to make my position very plain and clear, and I shall take but a minute to

do so. So far as I am personally concerned the people of my State elected me as one of the two Senators from my State under a contract to pay me \$10,000 a year. I want to make it very clear that I believe I would be betraying the trust of the people of the State of North Dakota if I voted to increase my own salary one single penny, either directly or by any artifice or subterfuge.

I intend to vote against any measure in any shape, manner, or form which will in any way increase that salary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], as amended.

Mr. LANGER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion for a moment?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. TOBEY. I wish to make a statement in the best of feeling to my colleague from North Dakota. He said that the people of his State elected him to serve here at a contract price of \$10,000. That is one way of putting it. I was elected in 1933 to serve in the House of Representatives, when the salary was \$10,000. One of the first acts I voted in favor of was an economy measure, so-called, which reduced my salary \$1,500 a year for 3 years. That was done by act of Congress. It was a commendable act. It was a necessary act. The condition which then prevailed no longer obtains in this country. I am only speaking to the Senator's argument that he was elected under contract. The Congress of the United States has the power to fix the salaries of its own Members, and that is what the amendment now pending proposes to do. It is not a question of a compact with the voters of the States at all. We are sufficient unto ourselves, and the people of whatever State we come from will accept our judgment, I am sure, with equanimity and with confidence.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I want to say that I was elected governor of my State at a salary of \$5,000. It was decreased 20 percent, and made \$4,000. I simply submit that if any Senator cannot get along on \$10,000 a year, the amount which was his pay at the time he was elected, he has a very simple method out, and that is to resign and let somebody else take his place who can live on \$10,000 a year.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Amplifying the remarks of my colleague on my right, again in the best of feeling, I point out that his argument seems to me to be that if costs have gone up and Senators cannot live on the \$10,000 fixed salary, then they can resign. Of course, that is elementary. We all know that. But is the Senator from North Dakota going to apply that rule all along the line to men who toil, men who labor, men who spin, and simply say to them if their costs of living go up, "If you do not like your job, get out"? Or is the Senator going to act as a statesman, a man of foresight and courage and

guts, and say to the men who labor and toil, "If your costs have gone up we are going to see to it that you receive adequate compensation"? What is the Senator's answer to that question?

Mr. LANGER. The answer to that is that in a period of drouth, when half our people in the drouth South were on relief, I did not notice United States Senators at that time reducing their salaries, let us say, one-half, to \$5,000, or such a sum as that.

Mr. TOBEY. That, Mr. President, does not answer my question. Would the Senator apply the rule he applied in the present case to those who toil for a living, and would he say to them, "If your living costs have gone up, and if you do not like your present condition, then get out and quit your job"? Is that the rule the Senator would apply to them?

Mr. LANGER. I will answer the Senator by saying that when Senators were conducting their election campaigns the salaries of Members of Congress were \$10,000 a year each, and everyone knew it. There are many individuals who do not run for public office because they figure they cannot get along on \$10,000 a year. If the salary of Members of Congress were \$15,000 a year the Senator from New Hampshire might have a candidate running against him in the State of New Hampshire who might say, "I will run for this office since the salary is \$15,000 a year." The Senator knew when he was running for Senator that he would receive a salary of \$10,000 a year for a period of 6 years.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota has not yet answered my question, but I will leave the matter as it now stands. My question was: In the specific instance I have given would the Senator apply the principle of economic sanction to those who toil, regardless of how much their cost of living has gone up? Would he say to them, "If you are not willing to accept the wage paid when you came on this job, very well, get out"? Is that the policy the Senator would adopt?

Mr. LANGER. The Senator speaks of policy. The situation is simply this, that the people who toil or who spin are not hired for a period of 6 years. They are not public officials. They hire out for a day or a month.

Mr. TOBEY. Or for a year—indeinitely, in future.

Mr. LANGER. Well, make it 5 years. They simply go to the boss who employs them, and talk it over, and they come to an agreement.

Mr. TOBEY. Would the Senator's answer to the people who toil be, "If you do not like your present situation, get out"?

Mr. LANGER. Oh, no. But, Mr. President, we are elected under a peculiar situation. We are in a position of trust. We cannot say, "We are going to raise our own salaries," because we are in that position of trust. We not only represent ourselves, but we represent the people of the country.

Mr. TOBEY. Do not the people of North Dakota, the State from which the Senator comes, have confidence enough in BILL LANGER, United States Senator,

to say, "He is down there in Washington on the job. He knows what the cost of living is. He knows the expenses that BILL LANGER and his colleagues have to meet. If they need more pay to meet expenses, then they ought to have it." Would not the people of North Dakota say that, I ask the Senator?

Mr. LANGER. I want to say to the junior Senator from New Hampshire that BILL LANGER is not going to put it up to the people of North Dakota or to the people of any other State.

Mr. TOBEY. If the question, as I have just stated it, were put to the people of the Senator's State, would they not say "Amen"?

Mr. LANGER. I do not think so.

Mr. TOBEY. Well, try it on them and see.

Mr. LANGER. No; I am not going to do that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I believe that the argument of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is extremely inconsistent. He contends that he made a contract with the people of North Dakota to work for a certain salary. I take it that the Senator from North Dakota intends to vote for the Downey bill. I intend to vote for the Downey bill. Most of those affected by that bill are now working under a contract with the Government, working under civil service at a certain rate of pay. According to the argument of the Senator from North Dakota, we would not be justified in voting for a 20-percent increase in the case of Government employees. They agreed to come to Washington, or to work in North Dakota or New Mexico, at a certain definite salary, under civil-service rules. However, I believe that under the circumstances which affect Government employees, the Congress is justified in voting them an increase of 20 percent, and possibly more.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The answer is, of course, that the distinguished Senator is begging the question. He knows very well that every man who takes a job under the Government realizes that if he renders satisfactory service he may receive more pay. He may be up-graded. But we are elected for a definite term of 6 years at \$10,000 a year. Perhaps some other man in New Mexico might have been a candidate for the same office had he known that the salary was to be \$15,000.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am willing to take a chance with anyone who wishes to take a shot at the Senatorship from New Mexico, either this afternoon or at election time. However, the point which the Senator made was that we were elected to Congress at a salary of \$10,000, and that, even if the cost of living should go up, we would not be justified in seeking an increase.

Last night the Committee on Appropriations worked until about 8 o'clock. It reported a bill which is being properly presented by the Senator from Tennessee. The bill involves appropriations of billions of dollars. Does the Senator believe that any private industry which

trusted a group of men to spend the amount of money carried in the bill which we are now considering would pay them only \$10,000 a year?

Mr. LANGER. The answer to that is that we knew exactly what we were going to get for a period of 6 years, namely, \$10,000 a year. A man working for private industry knows when he is employed that he may receive an increase.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the increase suggested by the Senator from Alabama becomes law the Senator from North Dakota, in keeping with his desire to comply with his agreement with the people of North Dakota, will not be compelled to take the increase.

Mr. LANGER. I understand that. Of course, I would not be compelled to take it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield. *

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, this situation reminds me of something which happened in my home State several years ago. In one of the largest counties in the State there was a movement to increase the salaries of county officers. The proposal met with the approval of everyone but the prosecuting attorney. He was asked if he did not want his salary raised. He said, "No. It may cause some good man to run against me." [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Mr. LANGER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hill	Pepper
Bankhead	Hoey	Radcliffe
Barkley	Huffman	Reed
Bilbo	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Bridges	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Brooks	Kilgore	Russell
Bushfield	Knowland	Saltonstall
Byrd	La Follette	Smith
Capper	Langer	Taylor
Carville	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McFarland	Tobey
Connally	McKellar	Tunnell
Donnell	McMahon	Tydings
Downey	Maybank	Vandenberg
Ellender	Mead	Wagner
Fulbright	Millikin	Walsh
Gerry	Mitchell	Wherry
Gossett	Moore	White
Green	Morse	Willis
Gurney	Murdoch	Wilson
Hawkes	Murray	Young
Hayden	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bilbo in the chair). Sixty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Mr. LANGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words about the proposed salary increase. I speak as a poor man. I have never been rich. During all my life I have always tried to be provident and keep my finances in as

good order as possible. Before I came to the Senate the greatest debt I ever incurred at one time was \$2,500. At the present time I am in debt to the extent of approximately \$14,000.

I am not excited about the contract. I did not draw up a contract to come here at a definite figure. I may have known just before I was elected to the Senate what the salary was. I ran three times before I made the grade. I am certain that I can say in all truth that during one or two of those campaigns I was not at all certain what the salary was. I did not care. I would have run if it had been \$5,000, \$6,000, or any other figure. I wanted to come to the United States Senate because I felt that I could be helpful to the people. So it is not a matter of the salary at which I agreed to come here. Some Senators may consider themselves bound by a sacred contract. The Senator from North Dakota says, "If you do not like it you can resign." Certainly if one had a high regard for his contract he would not resign. If he had agreed to come here for 6 years, and could not live on his salary, he would stay here and starve to death, but he would observe his contract.

I do not mean to imply that anyone is likely to starve on \$10,000 a year; but I think I can give a pretty fair account of what happens to a man who has no other resources. I came here and took up residence in a hotel. For five and one-half months my wife and I and two small children lived in a hotel. It was not very pleasant. During all that time we diligently sought some place to live. For \$250 a month we could have obtained an apartment just large enough for us to get into, with two bedrooms, no room to accommodate help of any kind, and no room for guests.

Mr. President, I repeat that we could have gotten an apartment of that kind for \$250 a month; that was the minimum. The only fly in the ointment was that those who controlled the apartment would not rent it to us because we had children. For a furnished house to accommodate us the owners or agents wanted around \$400 or \$500 a month. So we decided that the sensible thing to do was to buy a house. We found that a great majority of Senators live in the northwest section. So we went to a real-estate agent, and said to him, "We would like to live out there with the rest of the boys and be sociable." So he took me out there and showed me a house. It was a brick colonial house of seven rooms, with a lot about 12 feet wide and about 50 or 60 feet long on one side of the house. The garage doors were falling off their hinges; the plaster was coming off the ceilings in the house. It had an attic which was not finished, although the real-estate dealer pointed out that it would be very easy to finish it and have another room up there. He wanted \$24,000 for it. I said to him, "Mister, I am in the wrong neighborhood. You can just turn around and start in another direction, some place."

So he took my wife and me into the Southeast section, and we looked around. We looked at row houses. They are

pushed right up together, you know, and they are very dark. My family have not been used to living in luxury, but at least out in Idaho there is lots of sunshine, and it is free. [Laughter.] In Idaho we had windows on all four sides of our house and we could get some sunshine without any extra cost.

We looked at row houses. Even the best of them are dingy. That is the only way they can be described. The owner of one wanted \$10,000 for it. I offered to buy it for that figure, and the woman said she would speak to her husband about it. When I went back they wanted \$12,000.

Then I went across the street, near here, and found an old row house three stories high, on top of a basement, and the basement was on top of the ground. But there was one good thing about the house: it had hardwood floors. Well, the owner wanted \$8,500 for that one. We would have gotten lots of exercise running up and down the four flights of stairs, and the house would have had to be remodeled and refurbished completely before we could live in it. So I said, "Well, I will take it; but first I want to see a contractor, to see how much it will cost to fix it up so that we can live in it." The owners wanted \$8,500 for the house; and I found out that a contractor would want \$5,000 to fix it up so that we could live in it. But I said, "Well, all right; I guess it is about the best deal we can get." So I went back to the house, but when I got there it had a sign on the front, "Sold." They had sold it while I was considering the contract. [Laughter.]

So we started looking again. We found a house. It was a double-width row house, made of brick. It was twice as wide as any other row house we had seen, but the owners wanted \$15,000 for it. We had decided that we could not possibly go above \$10,000, but that house looked much nicer than a single-width row house; it looked something like a real house; it had some room in it. So we decided we would take it, anyway. We bought it in March, with the understanding that we could occupy it within 30 days. But we did not actually get in until May; we simply could not get the people out of it before then.

So we are there now. There is nothing fancy about the house. It was built long ago when hardwood was plentiful but pine was scarce. So all the trimmings of the house are made of hardwood, but they are real high-toned and the floors are made of pine.

I saw plainly that we would not be able to make ends meet, the way things were going; so I put my wife on the pay roll, and she is on the pay roll now. We have always worked together, and regardless of whether she was on the pay roll, I am sure she would spend a great deal of her time at the office because we enjoy each other's company. Nevertheless, she is on the pay roll and she is going to stay there until someone passes a law that will take her off the pay roll. [Laughter.]

So I feel that most certainly Members of the Congress should have more money. I do not believe the people of Idaho expect me to go into debt, as I

have had to do here, and stay in that condition and pay out a good percentage of my salary as interest to the banks, as I am doing now.

I may point out that last night I read in the newspaper that Mr. Mayer, of Loew's, Inc., which I believe is the name of the organization, made \$900,000 last year. That is almost as much as the entire Senate made. Well, maybe he is worth more than all of us put together; I do not know. [Laughter.] I will wager that he has more guts than there are here. Even if we trim down the figure and consider it after the deduction of taxes, Mr. Mayer receives a greater net income than do more than 14 Senators.

We have had presented to us the Heller study, which was made by a group composed of labor leaders, farmer representatives, consumer representatives, and business leaders. They studied the problem, and they said Members of Congress should be paid at least \$25,000 a year. The mayor of New York is paid that much, I understand. Bill Green and John L. Lewis get that much. Yet we who must decide on stupendous tax bills and appropriations and UNRRA and all the other problems which come up do not seem to think we are worth the money.

I am not afraid of raising our salaries. If after raising our salaries I find that a better man will run against me and will beat me, that will be all right. I came here firmly determined to vote as though I never expected to come back here. I am going to work like hell to get back [laughter], but I am going to vote that way.

I wish to compliment the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] for taking the firm, courageous stand which he did. I wish to compliment the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] for his action in this matter. I understand he is a man of considerable wealth, and I appreciate especially having a man in his position stick out his neck when he does not have to do so. I wish to compliment the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] for putting up the fight he has made on this proposition. I understand that the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], also a wealthy man, is likewise in favor of the proposal.

Certainly I do not wish to see this body become a rich man's club. As the Senator from North Dakota said, if you do not like it you can quit and let someone who has more money take the job. Mr. President, that is what it amounts to.

Mind you, I will stay here at \$10,000; I would stay here at \$5,000. In that event I would pitch a tent out here on the lawn, and I would defy them to put me off. So I would stay here. But I do not believe the people intend to have us receive such small salaries while we are representing them here.

I wish to call attention to the fact that we are allowed no tax deductions whatever—none at all. I also wish to call attention to the fact that Representative RAMSPECK and Representative WOODRUM have resigned from the House of Representatives simply for financial reasons—or else they did not tell the truth. They

said that was the reason, and I am willing to take their word for it.

The other day Secretary Clinton Anderson appeared before us, and he was practically crying. He said his good men were leaving his Department because he could not pay them enough.

Mr. President, I will vote for any measure which may be proposed to provide for either temporarily or permanently increasing the salaries of Members of Congress. As I have said, if any Member of Congress does not wish to receive the increased salary, he can vote to help us poor benighted heathens who do want it to receive it, and then he will not have to take it for himself.

So, Mr. President, for all these reasons I hope this amendment will be adopted. I believe its adoption is justified by all the facts of the case. I do not believe that we signed any contract to continue here at the same salary. In fact, we did not sign any contract. At any rate, we got the job to come here and be Senators, to think for ourselves and, literally, to think for the people of America insofar as legislation is concerned. There is only one way in the world to raise congressional salaries, and that is for us to raise them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], as modified. On this question the yeas and nays have been demanded and ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BANKHEAD (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and will vote. I vote "yea." If the Senator from Louisiana were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY and Mr. MYERS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] are detained at a meeting of the Joint Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained on official business at various Government departments.

I announce further that on this question the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] has a pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK]. I am advised that if present the Senator from Nevada [Mr.

McCARRAN] would vote "yea," and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] would vote "nay."

I wish to announce further that if present and voting the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY and Mr. MYERS] would vote "yea" and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been excused. He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is absent on official business. If present he would vote "nay." His general pair and transfer has been announced.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent due to the necessity for special treatment for his recent injury.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORBON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANFILL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is detained in a committee meeting.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], who would vote "nay" if present, is paired on this question with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], who would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—23

Bankhead	Hoey	Murray
Bridges	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Chavez	Kilgore	Taylor
Downey	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	McMahon	Tobey
Green	Mead	Tydings
Hayden	Mitchell	Wagner
Hill	Morse	

NAYS—45

Austin	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Ball	Hickenlooper	Reed
Barkley	Huffman	Revercomb
Bilbo	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Brooks	Knowland	Russell
Bushfield	La Follette	Saltonstall
Byrd	Langer	Smith
Capper	McFarland	Tunnell
Carville	McKellar	Vandenberg
Connally	Maybank	Walsh
Dornell	Millikin	Wherry
Ellender	Moore	White
Gerry	Murdoch	Willis
Gossett	O'Daniel	Wilson
Gurney	O'Mahoney	Young

NOT VOTING—28

Aiken	Ferguson	Overtton
Andrews	George	Shipstead
Bailey	Glass	Stanfill
Brewster	Guffey	Stewart
Briggs	Hart	Taft
Buck	Hatch	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Lucas	Wheeler
Capehart	McCarran	Wiley
Cordon	Magnuson	
Eastland	Myers	

So Mr. BANKHEAD's amendment as modified was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 14, to insert:

The unobligated balance of the appropriation for mileage of the President of the Senate and of Senators, for the fiscal year 1945, is reappropriated and made available for the fiscal year 1946.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 18, to insert:

The Legislative Branch Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1946 is hereby amended by striking out "night watchman, \$1,920", under the Office of the Secretary of the Senate, and inserting in lieu thereof "special officer, \$2,280", and the necessary amount is hereby authorized to be expended from the appropriation for salaries of officers and employees of the Senate beginning January 1, 1946.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 3, to insert:

Beginning January 1, 1946, the salary of the secretary for the majority shall be at the rate of \$5,400 per annum and \$1,500 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 4, to insert:

The Sergeant at Arms is authorized to install in the offices of Senators special telephone wiring plans with features to pick up, hold and intercommunicate on one to three lines, the cost thereof to be paid out of the appropriation for "Miscellaneous items, contingent expenses of the Senate."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 9, to insert:

For an additional allowance for stationery of \$500 for each Senator and the President of the Senate, for the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, \$48,500, to be immediately available and to remain available until June 30, 1946.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 13, to insert:

For an additional amount for "miscellaneous items," exclusive of labor, fiscal year 1945, \$15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contingent expense of the House," on page 4, after line 8, to insert:

Whenever the usual day for paying salaries in or under the Senate or House of Representatives falls on Saturday, the respective disbursing officers are authorized to make such payments on the preceding workday.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 12, to insert:

NATIONAL MEMORIAL STADIUM COMMISSION
For carrying out the provisions of Public, No. 523, of the Seventy-eighth Congress, entitled "Joint resolution to consider a site and design for a National Memorial Stadium to be erected in the District of Columbia," approved December 20, 1944, fiscal year 1945, \$1,183.47, to remain available until June 30, 1946, and to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers approved by the Chairman of the Commission.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 21, to insert:

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING
The provisions of section 6 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917," approved May 10, 1916, as amended (relating to dual compensation), shall not apply to services rendered by the assistant clerk and stenographer of the Joint Committee on Printing from May 16 to August 3, 1944.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Architect of the Capitol," on page 5, after line 6, to insert:

CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Capitol buildings: For an additional amount for the Capitol Building, including the same objects specified under this head in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1946, \$19,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 11, to insert:

Erection of a statue of George Washington on the Capitol Grounds: To enable the Architect of the Capitol to acquire a statue of George Washington and a suitable granite pedestal upon which to erect such statue and to defray all expenses of erecting such statue upon the Capitol grounds, all as authorized by the act of June 11, 1940 (54 Stat. 299), \$25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "The Judiciary—Court of Customs and Patent Appeals," on page 6, after line 4, to insert:

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS OF EXPENSE

Salaries of criers: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946; for "salaries of criers," \$20,000.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the amendment?

Mr. McKELLAR. This provides for 16 additional criers who shall act as bailiffs and messengers for the Federal judges. They will receive salaries of \$2,100 per annum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Executive Office of the President," on page 6, after line 12, to insert:

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1946, to enable the President to carry out the provisions of the act of March 28, 1944 (Public Law 267, 78th Cong.), to be available for expenditure in the manner specified in the appropriation for this purpose in the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration Participation Appropriation Act, 1945, and subject to the recommendations contained in the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration Participation Act, 1946, \$400,000,000: *Provided*, That this additional appropriation shall not become available prior to the enactment of the bill (H. R. 4649, 79th Cong.) to enable the United States to further participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment on page 7, line 1, to strike out "\$400,000,000" and insert "\$750,000,000."

Mr. President, the House has passed a bill authorizing \$1,350,000,000 more for UNRRA. The Senate committee has reported the bill. This amendment would make the appropriation contingent upon that bill becoming the law.

It was reported to the full committee that now is the crucial time to make these appropriations if any are to be made. It is said that looking after the needy in the countries which are enumerated in the bill will require at least the \$750,000,000, until April 1, and in ad-

dition thereto furnish seed for the planting of crops in the various countries where there have been very much smaller crops because of the ravages of war.

For that reason the President has very urgently requested that the additional appropriation be fixed at \$750,000,000. It seems to me that if the Congress is to authorize it, it would be better to provide the money while it will do the most good. We all know that the principal distress and trouble will occur between now and the 1st of April, and it seems to me that the seed should be furnished in order to give these distressed people a chance to make crops for themselves in the coming year.

Mr. President, for these reasons the amount carried in the amendment is sought to be raised from \$400,000,000 to \$750,000,000. The vote in the committee was very close. I hope the Senate will generously provide this sum for the poor and needy of the other countries, and give them a chance to work out their salvation by furnishing them seed.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will the amount first proposed, \$400,000,000, or the \$750,000,000 proposed by the able Senator from Tennessee, be taken into consideration when the new appropriation for UNRRA, just passed by the House, comes before the Senate?

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not catch the question.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will the figure which is placed in the bill, whether it be \$400,000,000 or \$750,000,000, as now proposed by the Senator, be deducted from any amount hereafter appropriated for UNRRA?

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course it will be. The bill in the House and the bill reported by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations have authorized the appropriation of \$1,350,000,000. The amount carried in the bill now before the Senate will be taken out of that authorization. We cannot appropriate unless an appropriation is authorized, and if the Senator will examine the amendment he will see that inasmuch as the bill which was reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations yesterday has not passed, we have to provide that this appropriation shall not be available until the bill passes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That means that if the authorization is passed, whatever may be appropriated under the pending bill will be a credit against that authorization?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true. The Senator has it exactly correct.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I wish to reiterate what I said in the committee. We are going at the foreign loan business and the UNRRA appropriations just as if we were going over Niagara Falls. We cannot go over a little bit. We are apparently over. We were told originally that \$1,350,000,000 would be the end. We were given that assurance by Governor Lehman. But before they were through

they were here with another request for \$1,300,000,000.

At that time I complained that we did not know where this money was going, and no Member of the Senate knows today. We have not had a hearing and pinned Governor Lehman down to find out whether the needy will actually get this money.

Mr. McKELLAR. Governor Lehman was before the committee, and every Senator on the subcommittee had the right to pin him down and ask him any question on earth he desired to ask.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the Senator say to me now that he is convinced that all this money will reach only those who are the needy?

Mr. McKELLAR. I could not say so because I have not the information.

Mr. BROOKS. No one else can say so.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think anyone on earth can say that. All we can do is to take the word of those who are administering the appropriation.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the Senator say whether or not he believes the people who are the beneficiaries of the relief even imagine it comes from America?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am not so sure about that. I will state to the Senate what I said to the committee yesterday. My own judgment is that we should see to it that the money goes without cost to the people for whom it is appropriated—that is, to the people themselves, and not to various governmental agencies. On an amendment to that effect I was voted down, and my recollection is my distinguished friend the Senator from Illinois helped vote me down. Am I wrong about that?

Mr. BROOKS. The Senator is dead wrong about it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am happy to make the correction, then, in my own mind, and to make the statement to the Senate, because I would not do the Senator an injustice for anything in the world. The Senator is too good a man for anyone to do him an injustice.

Mr. BROOKS. I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that when we were appropriating \$500,000,000 I made my protest that we had not written anything into the law which would insure that the recipients of relief would at least know that it came from America, and at that time the distinguished Acting Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations said he would join me in that.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did join the Senator, but, unfortunately, my amendment was voted down.

Mr. BROOKS. I am sure we cannot stop this now, but I protest again, and say that in passing these laws relating to foreign dealings under the UNRRA we are not insisting that the people in the foreign countries at least know where the money is coming from, and there is no provision which would enable us to know that they actually get the food. I protest against giving the money to foreign governments and letting them do whatever they want with the money to further their power politics, regardless of the people who are starving. I cannot conscientiously oppose an ap-

propriation to feed the poor, but I can conscientiously oppose the way we are doing it.

A bill comes over from the House and is referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. They report it to the Senate. Before we even see it, we have to appropriate the money. They say they are not responsible for the appropriation, we say we are not responsible for the legislation, but like a flood the money goes out, and it will continue to go out, until somebody says, "Stop this thing until we can ascertain that the people of the world are going to be at least grateful for the hard-earned taxes our people will have to pay for the rest of their lives because of their great, Christian-hearted, humanitarian instincts."

I realize I cannot stop this today, but I am going to keep on protesting, and with all my energy I ask the Committee on Foreign Relations, before they come again with a bill, please to write into the bill a provision which will prescribe where the money is to go, so that at least we may be assured where it goes.

Mr. McCLELLAN and Mr. CONNALLY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield first to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois made reference to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I should like to comment.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator from Arkansas will permit, I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Certainly.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Illinois seems to lay the blame on the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BROOKS. I did not lay it on one committee. I laid it on both committees.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator referred to the fact that the Committee on Foreign Relations had reported the bill before he saw it. If the Senator had cared to appear at the hearings, he could have seen it and could have testified. The Committee on Foreign Relations held hearings for 2 days on the matter, and we invited anyone who cared to come and testify to appear; so the Committee on Foreign Relations is not solely responsible. We did report an authorization, but the Senator from Illinois does not have to vote for the appropriation unless he cares to do so. The appropriation is one thing, and the authorization is another, so it is up to the Senator from Illinois. If he does not like it, he can vote "no."

Mr. BROOKS. I suggest to the Senator that I did vote "no," and I will vote "no" again, not because I do not want suffering people fed, but because I am not sure they will get the food.

Mr. CONNALLY. The only way the Senator could be sure about that would be for him to go over and distribute the food himself.

Mr. BROOKS. It would be much better if we had Americans distributing the food, and it would be better if we had veterans who fought in these countries placed in charge. I understand we are

to give hundreds of millions of dollars to Italy, and there are many servicemen who were in Italy, away from their families, trying to beat down the Italians to the point where they would quit shooting our soldiers, and if we would send some of our servicemen back to distribute this money, they could at least let recipients know that America was sending it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Senators of both the majority and minority were present when the committee went into this matter, and there was not a vote against the authorization. It is up to the Senate to decide whether it wants to appropriate the money or not. It is easy enough for the Senator from Illinois to talk about the questions he raises. Anyone can do that. That is one thing, and our duty here is another.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I shall yield to the Senator from Arkansas in a moment, but before doing so let me say to the Senator from Illinois that I am sure he recalls that the acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations took a very determined, firm, and vigorous stand in favor of putting into the Appropriation Act exactly what the Senator suggests on the floor of the Senate today. I still think it was a mistake not to have done it, but it was not done. It has all depended on whether we pass the authorization bill which is before the Senate. So every Senator will have two whacks at the proposal, once in voting against the appropriation if he feels he should do it, and once in voting against the authorization bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Very much of the information I desired to obtain has already been given since I first rose and asked the Senator to yield. I did want to understand—and I did not understand on the first reading of the amendment—I did want to understand that this appropriation is yet subject to the action of Congress, even if the amount contained in this bill is authorized. It is still subject to the action of the Congress on the bill which has been reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is entirely correct about that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I want to ask the Senator whether he knows if the bill reported by the Foreign Relations Committee makes any change in the basic law, the law we passed originally.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have not read it and I would refer the Senator to the Senator from Texas. I inquire of the Senator from Texas if the bill reported by his committee makes any change in the terms of the basic law respecting UNRRA.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In other words, is the bill reported by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee practically the same as the original act?

Mr. CONNALLY. Practically so. I have not compared them line by line. Any Senator can examine them.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I voted against the original bill because I thought then, and I think it is being demonstrated now, that we have been providing the money and paying about

90 percent of every dollar that goes into UNRRA.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; 71 and a fraction percent is paid by the United States. The largest part of the remainder is paid by Great Britain and Russia.

Mr. RUSSELL. No, Mr. President; not Russia.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; Russia makes no contribution.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Except to the cost of administration.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; the contribution to administration is paid on the same pro rata basis of percentage.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Russia does make a contribution under the basic law, as I remember, to the administration expense.

Mr. McKELLAR. Wait one moment and I will give the Senator the figures.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think that is correct. That is unimportant, however.

Mr. McKELLAR. That was my idea, but it was disputed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who is a member of the committee, and one of the most valuable members of the committee. His statement made me hesitate and doubt whether I was correct in the matter.

Mr. McCLELLAN. My recollection is that Russia makes no contribution to UNRRA—that is, to the funds which are distributed—but it does make a contribution to the administrative expense, the expense of distributing. I think that is correct. That is my recollection of the original act. The Senator from Tennessee says we are paying approximately 71 percent.

Mr. McKELLAR. A little more than 71 percent.

Mr. McCLELLAN. A little more than 71 percent; that is assuming that all the other countries are contributing. But I dare say that if we take into account that part which has been contributed by Great Britain and by other countries out of lend-lease we have given them, it will be found we are contributing more than 90 percent of the total amount.

Mr. McKELLAR. I could not say about that, but the Administrator said that all other countries had paid their pro rata share as agreed upon.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is very much like the situation we have now respecting the loan to Britain. Britain will come into the International Bank and will do several other things if we will furnish the money. That is the way they have gone into UNRRA. We furnished them lend-lease and then they came along with their contribution to supplement our direct contribution of more than 71 percent of the whole.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is clear we have furnished 71 percent.

Mr. McCLELLAN. We have furnished directly 71 percent and more indirectly. That is the reason I make this point. I opposed the bill in the beginning, and the record of my remarks at that time will substantiate what I am saying now. Distribution is being made in the name of an international organization, and we are furnishing substantially all of the money. We find ourselves in the situation today where this relief money and

goods and services and so forth are actually being turned over to governments of other countries and they are administering it and distributing it in the name of those governments, and taking credit for it, and America is getting no credit. Yet America is paying 90 percent of the bill. I do not like the set-up. I want to make and am willing to make a contribution to the people of the world who need help. I want to do it, however, in the name of America, and under the American flag, and let those who receive help know that America is giving them the help they are getting. But today it is not being done that way.

Mr. President, I had a little opportunity while overseas to inquire how UNRRA was administered. The reports I received, and I received them from high authority, were to the effect that UNRRA was not being administered so America received any credit for what was done whatever. I think that is true. For that reason I am not going to vote for the bill to continue UNRRA. I will vote for a bill to authorize appropriations to be expended in the name of my own country, and let the American people get credit for it, and let the help go direct to those who need it, and not to some other government which will distribute it to their political advantage and get credit for it. Let the people know that America is doing it.

It is proposed that we spend a great deal of money for this purpose. How will that money be obtained? It will not be obtained by taxing ourselves. Every dollar of it will be added to the national debt. You, Mr. President, know that, and I know it. We are taxing others who are to come after us, to pay for this. But I do think that since our Government is willing to go so far to help those in distress, I think it ought to be done in the name of the United States of America. For that reason I am going to oppose this appropriation and I expect to oppose the original bill unless some correction is made in it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question. If the Senate passes the bill which has been reported from the Foreign Relations Committee, and authorizes an appropriation of \$1,350,000,000 for the purposes stated in the bill, does it not become the duty of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate to appropriate that money? Considering that this season of the year is the cold season, the trying season for the distressed people whom it is sought to aid, does not the Senator from Arkansas think that we ought to contribute sufficient at this time to tide them over until warmer weather comes and to give them the seed to plant their crops? It can be done with \$750,000,000, if it is appropriated now. It cannot be done if we appropriate only \$400,000,000. Does not the Senator think that if the Senate passes the bill reported by the Foreign Relations Committee—and this appropriation is dependent on whether the Senate passes that bill—we can do more good by distributing the money at the time when it is most needed?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That may be true, if we are going to spend the money. But

I do say to the Senator that since I am going to oppose the bill that authorizes the expenditure, I am not going to vote for the expenditure until I have voted against the bill. If we commit ourselves, then the situation may be different. I did not oppose the appropriation made the other day, but I thought that appropriation was to take care of the immediate needs.

Mr. McKELLAR. No. Those needs have already been met.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. When UNRRA was started we all understood it was to provide relief, not reconstruction, not rehabilitation, but relief for the suffering people of the liberated areas.

Mr. McKELLAR. The name of the organization is UNRRA—United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

Mr. BROOKS. But it was designed to relieve the people of the liberated areas. Now we have changed it somewhat, and I think the Senate ought to know where the money is going; what countries are going to receive it.

Mr. McKELLAR. It will be received by the same countries that received it before, except in the case of two subdivisions of Russia that now are also going to receive aid. Those are people who were overrun by the Germans and were kept under German rule for about 4 years, until the Russians received our help at Stalingrad and made the westward backswing toward Germany.

Mr. BROOKS. Can the Senator from Tennessee tell the Senate whether Russia has asked us to feed the people of these two subdivisions of Russia?

Mr. McKELLAR. No, I cannot. They are provided for in the bill. Governor Lehman testified that they had asked for this relief. I wish to say to the Senator that if people in Russia are suffering and we can help them I should like to help them for this reason: I think Russia helped us more in the last war than did any other nation.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not like to take issue with the Senator from Tennessee on that point, but I think the United States of America helped Russia much more than Russia helped us.

Mr. McKELLAR. Well, we helped Russia and Russia helped us. She had an army in the field against Germany which was not well fed, which was not well clothed, and did not have sufficient ammunition. We furnished the Russians with those things, and they did a wonderful work, and are now in possession of a part of Germany. I honor them and respect them for what they did. Everyone knows that there is not one-millionth of a particle of communism in me, but I honor and respect people who fight for their country, and I am willing to help them.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have no disrespect for Russia. I admire Russia for her contribution to the war. I take issue only when Senators stand up and say that Russia did a great deal more for us than we did for Russia.

Mr. McKELLAR. No, no. I stated that I thought that Russia had done more in this war to help America win it than had any other nation. I do not care what nation it is. I think I can maintain that position.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I wish to reiterate that this is a rather loosely handled affair in its entirety, and I resent turning over money to Russia without Russia asking for it and letting that Government sell our food to its people. We are going to tax our people to feed them, and no one in Russia will know where the food came from.

Mr. McKELLAR. Governor Lehman stated that two districts had applied for aid. Let me read what was said, so as to be certain about it:

I would also like to mention in this connection the limited program of relief and rehabilitation assistance through UNRRA to the two Soviet Republics of the Ukraine and White Russia. Any invaded country is entitled to seek UNRRA assistance, provided that the established procedures and policies for such assistance, as agreed upon among the member nations and embodied in the UNRRA resolutions, are observed. The Soviet Union had made an application for UNRRA aid shortly in advance of the Council meeting in the amount of \$700,000,000, which was only enough to cover a part of the minimum supplies essential to relieve their civilian population on terms similar to those of adjacent areas.

Those are the facts. For my part, I would infinitely rather help the indigent and needy in a nation which went to the front and helped us in this great struggle than to help the indigent and needy in countries which either played on both sides or which did not help us at all.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. A few days ago I heard that if one wished to see Mr. Lehman, he must first obtain the consent of a Britisher. I did not believe it at the time, but I hold in my hand the headquarters telephone directory, issued by the Bureau of Finance and Administration, Division of Administrative Services. Sure enough, I find that Mr. Lehman's assistant, in charge of the office here, the man whom one must see if he wishes to see Mr. Lehman, does not come from Tennessee. He does not come from the State of Montana. He does not come from Maine. He does not come from any one of our 48 States. He is a Britisher.

Looking further, we find the Office of Senior Deputy Director General, the man who will have charge of the \$750,000,000. Who is he? Not one of the veterans whom my distinguished friend from Illinois mentioned a few moments ago. He is Sir Robert Jackson, of England, who

has an office here, and who will handle the \$750,000,000 which we shall appropriate sooner or later. So I have prepared an amendment, to which I believe the Senator from Tennessee will have no objection. It is the same as the committee amendment, with this additional language:

Provided, That all of said money shall be administered and distributed by American veterans of World War I and World War II.

Would the Senator accept such an amendment?

Mr. McKELLAR. I would be loath to accept it without having any evidence on the question. The Senator could have brought that amendment before the committee, where it could have been considered by the committee. The committee did not refuse the request of anyone to be heard. It did not turn down Mr. Lehman and those associated with him. It did not turn down those who were against Mr. Lehman. I believe that Governor Lehman has a room in my hotel. I myself have never called on him, but I know that he would be glad to see the Senator at any time; and if the Senator has any trouble in meeting Mr. Lehman, I will take the trouble to see that the Senator meets Governor Lehman if he would like to meet him.

I believe that the Senator has a great deal of misinformation on this question. It is true that others than Americans are working for this service, because it is an Allied Nations' service. It is true that we furnish most of the money. We furnish 71 and a fraction percent of the money. It may be that all those in charge of the administration should be Americans. I certainly would like to see American soldiers get any jobs they want. I do not think I have ever turned down a soldier in my life. I have been a Member of Congress for 34 years, but I do not think I have ever turned down a soldier who wanted a job or who wanted any other favor. I do not expect to do so. But I do not believe that it is the proper thing to do to offer such an amendment at this point, providing that the administration of these funds shall be handled by returning soldiers, when we have not had any evidence on the question.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I should like to make this observation to the Senator from North Dakota: My information is that the second largest contributor to this fund is Great Britain. We contribute approximately 71 percent of the whole enterprise, but the 29 percent which we do not contribute amounts to approximately half a billion dollars, which is a very sizable sum of money. Of that half a billion dollars, the major portion comes from the British. It seems to me, therefore, entirely appropriate that in an international organization composed of 44 nations the deputy administrator, the next one under the head, the head being an American, should be a representative of the British. I am advised that the deputy administrator is not only a Britisher, but a Scotsman, and that he is very

cautious about the expenditure of money. So there is a positive advantage in having a Scotsman looking after our expenditures, to see that the money is not wasted. Perhaps there is an asset rather than a liability in that respect.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

Let us look at this thing in a fair way. Australia contributes to this fund. It is a part of the British Empire. It contributes \$38,000,000. Canada contributes \$69,000,000, and Egypt \$4,000,000. The Union of South Africa contributes \$18,000,000. The United Kingdom contributes \$322,000,000.

It will be seen, Mr. President, that the United States Government contributes the greater part of the fund, but the British Empire contributes a very large sum, the next largest sum. In order to sustain the statement which I have made, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks a table showing the contributions of all countries as of September 30, 1945.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Status of contributions (operating and administrative)—all countries, as of Sept. 30, 1945

[Values in United States dollar equivalents]			
Country	Total contributions authorized or in process of authorization	Total contributions paid or available on request	
(1)	(2)	Amount	Per cent
Australia.....	\$38,400,000	\$38,400,000	100
Belgium*	175,000	175,000	100
Bolivia.....	95,000	32,000	33
Brazil.....	20,000,000	10,000,000	33
Canada.....	69,369,000	69,369,000	100
Chile.....	2,153,000	0	0
China*	875,000	875,000	100
Colombia.....	2,356,000	52,000	2
Costa Rica.....	400,000	0	0
Cuba.....	35,000	35,000	100
Czechoslovakia*	175,000	100,000	57
Denmark*	19,000	0	0
Dominican Republic.....	350,000	245,000	70
Ecuador.....	150,000	0	0
Egypt.....	4,256,000	70,000	2
El Salvador.....	129,000	5,000	4
Ethiopia*	9,000	9,000	100
France*	700,000	700,000	100
Greece*	87,000	87,000	100
Haiti.....	9,000	9,000	100
Honduras.....	49,000	49,000	100
Iceland.....	59,000	59,000	100
India.....	718,000	718,000	100
Iran.....	24,042,000	24,042,000	100
Iraq.....	18,000	0	0
Liberia.....	18,000	18,000	100
Luxemburg*	9,000	9,000	100
Mexico.....	3,602,000	1,148,000	32
Netherlands*	262,000	262,000	100
New Zealand.....	8,476,000	8,476,000	100
Nicaragua.....	129,000	5,000	4
Norway*	52,000	52,000	100
Panama.....	400,000	142,000	35
Paraguay.....	38,000	10,000	26
Peru.....	1,000,000	793,000	79
Philippines*	9,000	9,000	100
Poland*	175,000	100,000	57
Union of South Africa.....	18,135,000	4,130,000	23

*The Council recommended that member countries whose area had not been occupied by the enemy contribute 1 percent of their national income for 1943. Countries indicated by the asterisk are those whose area was occupied by the enemy and such countries have contributed only to the administrative expenses.

Status of contributions (operating and administrative)—all countries, as of Sept. 30, 1945—Continued

[Values in United States dollar equivalents]			
Country	Total contributions authorized or in process of authorization	Total contributions paid or available on request	
(1)	(2)	Amount	Per cent
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*	\$1,750,000	\$1,000,000	57
United Kingdom.....	322,400,000	322,400,000	100
United States of America.....	1,350,000,000	800,000,000	59
Uruguay.....	520,000	485,000	93
Venezuela.....	1,017,000	17,000	2
Yugoslavia*	122,000	70,000	57
Total.....	1,822,760,000	1,284,166,000	68

Mr. McKELLAR. I now yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I ask the distinguished Senator from Arizona if he does not believe that when Mr. Lehman is called away, as he very frequently is, to Europe and other countries, the man in charge of all this money should be an American citizen? I may suggest that many American citizens are of Scotch ancestry.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this is the situation: If we ask other nations to join with us in this enterprise we must show our willingness to be cheerful givers, and ask them to give cheerfully. In order that that may be done, there must be some kind of recognition of the contributions made by other nations. Would the Senator go to the extreme and say, "Whereas 71 percent of this money is contributed by the United States, regardless of what other nations put into this fund they shall have no representation in determining how the money shall be distributed"? I am sure the Senator will agree that that would not be the right thing to do.

I cannot agree with Senators who say that this should be entirely an American operation. I base that statement upon our experience with American relief after the last war. We turned over to Mr. Hoover many millions of dollars. The relief was labeled American relief. The administration was headed by an American. The beneficiaries of that relief received aid from an American source, and it was so understood by everyone. What happened? We did not have enough to go around. We did not give everyone all he wanted, and when we came out of it we gained no particular credit. Looking back 25 years ago, does anyone think that there are people in Europe who are grateful to America when we did not have money enough to take care of them fully?

There is an advantage in the present arrangement. There will not be money sufficient to take care of all the needy, but the failure to take care of all the needy will not be blamed upon the United States alone, which is considered the richest country in the world and able to grant relief. A world organization composed of 44 nations will say, "We have come to the time when we must

stop." That time has been fixed by the organization, so far as Europe is concerned, as the 31st of December next year, approximately a year from now. In other areas it will extend into the spring of the following year.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to reply to the question which was raised by the Senator from North Dakota. The other evening I spent more than 2 hours with the Deputy Administrator, who comes from London. At first he did not impress me. After talking with him and listening to him for more than 2 hours I was very much impressed with his knowledge of the whole situation throughout Europe, as well as the situation in China and Korea. I believe that he is a very careful administrator. We, who put up 71 percent of the money, have the Administrator in Governor Lehman. He is the policy-maker, as I understand. The man to whom I refer is the Deputy Administrator, with personnel under him. I should say that he is an extremely well qualified man. He did 4 years' work in Malta. Following that he did a great deal of work in Cairo. As the distinguished Senator from Arizona has stated, he is a Scotsman. After listening to him, I came to the conclusion that he was extremely careful as to how the money was being spent.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts believe that out of 130,000,000 Americans, we could find one just as capable as the man the Senator has described?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Certainly.

Mr. LANGER. Then why should not we use him?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Because the policy-maker is an American, and I think it is much more important that the policy-maker be an American, rather than to have an American as the administrator of personnel, who is under the policy-maker. I think an American should be the one to be the policy-maker, the one to guide the policies. That is what I am proposing.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me answer the Senator from North Dakota. He has suggested an amendment which he wishes to have me accept on behalf of the committee. The Senator has had some little experience with the workings of the Appropriations Committee for the last several weeks because he has been before it. I am quite sure he would say openly, to everyone, that that committee has acted exceedingly fair and just and has heard all witnesses who cared to be heard.

Mr. LANGER. I will attest to that; it is true.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have tried to be exceedingly fair in every way, not only in respect to this matter, but in respect to all other matters. I do not think the Senator, upon reflection, would ask us to accept an amendment of this kind unless testimony had been adduced. The Senator can get one opinion about UNRRA from one person and another opinion

about it from another person. After all, we depend upon the testimony which is presented to us; and if ever there was a free and fair opportunity for all interested people to be heard on all the questions which come before us, it was had in connection with consideration of this deficiency bill by the committee. We have been daily at work, as I remember, for approximately 6 weeks. We have been at work very vigorously for 2 weeks, but the matter has been before us for twice that long, I am sure. We have been working very vigorously and actively, trying to settle these questions. We barred the door to no one who wished to tell us what he thought about the question before us.

So I hope the Senator from North Dakota will not insist upon the amendment which he has suggested.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Personally, I wish to attest to the very fine work of the Appropriations Committee. However, in my judgment the committee is not informed about the work of UNRRA. For example, I hold in my hand a list of the heads of UNRRA in all the countries in which it is operating. Does the Senator from Tennessee know that 90 percent of all the men who are administering UNRRA in Europe are Britishers? I can understand why it might be necessary to hire one occasionally, of course.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to relate to the Senator a story which will show how wrong he is.

Mr. LANGER. Well, I hold the list in my hand.

Mr. McKELLAR. A soldier who has returned from one of the European countries receiving UNRRA aid said that while he was abroad he entered a restaurant to eat lunch, and that after he had been there a few minutes a man drove up in an American limousine with UNRRA marked on it. The soldier—a major in the Army, and he is a splendid young man—said he thought that would be a good chance to talk to someone from home, especially in view of the fact that when the UNRRA officer entered the restaurant he sat down at the same table, to eat his lunch. So the major said to him, "How did you leave things at home?"

The answer was, "Huh?"

The major said, "Well, how did you leave things in America?"

Again the answer was, "Huh?"

Then the major said, "Don't you speak English?"

Again the answer was, "Huh?"

In other words, Mr. President, the UNRRA representative could not speak a word of English. Certainly, if England has reached the point of having men who cannot speak the English language, that is most unusual.

I do not believe all these UNRRA men are English. I think all the nations are represented proportionally or substantially proportionally among the UNRRA representatives. Out of a total of 8,471, Great Britain has 2,285.

Mr. LANGER. Yes; but I am speaking of the heads. They are the ones I am interested in.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the head was not an American, the Senator would have some complaint, it seems to me. But the head of this organization is an American; he is a former Governor of the State of New York. He has a very excellent reputation. I do not know him, except very casually, but he bears a very fine reputation. I believe he has twice been elected Governor of the State of New York, and apparently he acted in a very reasonable and sensible way while serving as Governor of that State.

It seems to me, since we furnish 71 percent of the funds for this purpose, that if the head of the organization was not an American, there would be some reason for complaint on our part. But when we furnish the larger part of the fund and when Great Britain as an empire furnishes the second largest amount, nothing could be more natural or fairer, in my judgment, than that the head of the organization should be an American and that the second in command should be a representative of the British Empire. For that reason, it seems to me the Senator's argument is not well founded.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if I may be permitted to say a word at this juncture, I should like to point out to the distinguished acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee that in the same conference which I had with the Deputy Administrator the other evening he told me—and the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], who was there, will confirm the statement—that there are now openings for at least three Americans among their top policy positions, if they can get them, but that the great difficulty is to get American citizens who will serve at the salaries which UNRRA is able to pay.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me once more?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to make clear to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, the acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee, that I am not impugning anything in regard to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand.

Mr. LANGER. The Appropriations Committee is a very fine group of men, and they treated me nicely; but I wish to say that I hold in my hand a list of the top men in the UNRRA organization, and the list shows their addresses and locations.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will have the list printed in the RECORD. However, under the circumstances, in view of the fact that the British Empire is furnishing the second largest share of the fund and, I suppose, is being as generous as it can be, it seems to me that in all fairness the British should have the second place in the administration of the fund.

Mr. LANGER. Then I will adopt the suggestion of the distinguished acting chairman of the committee and I will ascertain the country of origin of each of the men on the list, and I will have that information placed following the name of each of them.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well; that will be fine.

Mr. LANGER. In that way the distinguished Senator from Tennessee will have the information. I shall submit it to him, and he can have it placed in the Record if he wishes to do so.

I simply wish to call attention to the fact that in Frankfurt, Germany, the man in charge of the operations of UNRRA is Lt. Gen. Sir Frederick Morgan.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me say that no UNRRA relief is being furnished in Germany.

Mr. LANGER. I beg the Senator's pardon; I have the information on the list which I hold in my hand.

Mr. McKELLAR. It may be on the list, but I am sure UNRRA is not furnishing relief in Germany. Relief in Germany is being furnished by the Army—not by UNRRA.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. Perhaps UNRRA is supervising the work at camps in Germany where displaced persons are temporarily located, but no German receives relief under UNRRA. A citizen of another country who, during the war, was taken prisoner, sent to Germany, and used there as a slave laborer, and is now temporarily held in a camp in Germany until he can be returned to his native country, can receive UNRRA relief. UNRRA is supervising work of that kind. If a large number of Frenchmen, Italians, Austrians, or citizens of various other countries, who were captured by the Germans during the war and were taken to Germany and placed in concentration camps there, met with some delay in returning to their homes after they were released, would the Senator object to having UNRRA employ a British lieutenant general to supervise them until they could be sent home?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, my objection is that a great many nations contribute to UNRRA relief, and I do not see why 90 percent of the heads of UNRRA in Europe and 50 percent of the heads of UNRRA in the East should be British citizens. That is my opinion.

Mr. McKELLAR. That cannot be the case, because I have before me a list of the persons who are employed by UNRRA, and it indicates the nations from which they come. The total number is 8,471, and only 2,285 come from Great Britain.

Mr. McCLELLAN. How many come from the United States?

Mr. McKELLAR. Two thousand three hundred and fifty-three come from the United States.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Two thousand three hundred and fifty-three of those in the employ of UNRRA are from the United States; is that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. And the total number of UNRRA employees is approximately 8,000?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, how many of the heads which UNRRA employs in the various countries are British citizens and how many are American citizens?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not believe the tabulation which I have shows the heads by countries.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I think it would be very unfortunate if an amendment such as the one which has been suggested should be accepted.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is the Senator speaking of my amendment?

Mr. TUNNELL. No; I am speaking of the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator from Delaware is in favor of the amendment which I have offered to increase the amount to \$750,000,000, because if we are to help these people at all, the necessary funds should be promptly appropriated. Of course, the money cannot be used until the Senate authorizes the appropriation. If the authorization is made, at least the sum proposed will be spent.

Mr. TUNNELL. I am strongly in favor of the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee; but to incorporate a proviso that the money which we contribute for the use of the UNRRA can be spent only by an American is merely to invite restrictions by other nations, and we would soon face the situation of the UNRRA having no authority to spend or allocate any money. Such a situation would be very unfortunate.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the Senator is entirely correct. I believe that we should not do anything in the Senate which would bring about a situation of the kind to which the Senator has referred. I may say that the committee had all the facts before it. I am sure that there was some mistake made in connection with the statement that 90 percent of the employees are of British appointment.

Mr. TUNNELL. The money which is being distributed in the various foreign countries is spent by the governments of those countries.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. TUNNELL. So I cannot conceive of all those who are associated with the distribution of the funds being under British control.

Mr. McKELLAR. They are not under British control.

Mr. TUNNELL. If the pending proposal is not for the purpose of saving lives and the relief of suffering, we should not contribute anything at all.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. TUNNELL. If the money is to be used for such a cause, we should not object too much to the person who will be appointed to do the job.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. First of all, I wish to say that I have enjoyed the Senator's exposition of UNRRA's case. I think he has presented it very well.

With reference to the personnel involved, we must always have in mind that the work to be done is not here in this country, but is abroad. The necessity for speaking the language of the country in which the work is being done is always present. Until very recently

it was difficult to recruit a sufficient personnel in this country to take care of the work abroad. We were told that the cost of employing natives of the localities in which the work was being done was insignificant in comparison to the cost of taking our people to those countries for the purpose of administering the work.

Mr. McKELLAR. That fact was brought out before the committee, and I thank the Senator for bringing it out again.

Mr. MEAD. Immediately after UNRRA was organized it was necessary to recruit hastily a commission for each of the various countries in which UNRRA was to operate. But now the political and military situation is much clearer and many of the commissions are being reorganized. Take, for example, the Polish Commission. The man who is heading that commission is one of the heroes of the war, a general of the Canadian Army by the name of Drewry. By the way, he was in command of a large Polish force in the Hook of Holland. Associated with him on that commission are outstanding Polish Americans from Detroit, New York, Milwaukee, and other cities in the United States. They are men who were leaders in their respective communities, and are entirely familiar with the situation in Poland. They have been enabled to become members of the commission because the political and military situation of the world has cleared.

Mr. McKELLAR. Are they American citizens?

Mr. MEAD. Yes.

Mr. President, I ask that the amendment to the committee amendment be agreed to.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I dislike very much to differ with the distinguished acting chairman of the committee; but I believe that a majority of the committee reduced the request from \$750,000,000 to \$400,000,000 on the basis that \$400,000,000 would carry UNRRA until at least March 1 and thereby give the committee, upon reconvening in January, an opportunity to call before it Assistant Secretary of State Clayton and perhaps Governor Lehman, and take another look at the way UNRRA is running its show. This item was brought up late yesterday afternoon, following the close of the hearings, on a verbal request of the President, as well as a letter from Representative CANNON, chairman of the House committee. No testimony was introduced in regard to the subject. It seems to me that if \$400,000,000 will carry UNRRA until March 1, and until the committee can take a look at the matter again, the figure contained in the committee amendment is an appropriate one and should be agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I read from a memorandum from the State Department:

If UNRRA is to ship the \$700,000,000 worth of supplies which it has scheduled for February, March, April, and May, it must have the money to order those supplies immediately. In January alone UNRRA must furnish the procuring agencies of the United States Government—the Department of Agriculture and Treasury procurement—with

orders amounting to \$315,000,000, to be paid for out of money UNRRA does not now have. In February it must furnish the procurement agencies with orders amounting to an additional \$254,000,000. In March it must furnish orders amounting to \$230,000,000. That means that it must place orders exceeding \$700,000,000 within the first 3 months of next year. It cannot place those orders until it receives the money from this Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire memorandum be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNRRA urgently requires an additional appropriation of at least \$750,000,000 before the recess period. The reasons why an appropriation of at least \$750,000,000 is required are as follows:

1. The supplies and services financed out of the first \$1,350,000,000 appropriation made by the United States will have been completely used up by the middle of February. That includes the \$550,000,000 which has just been appropriated by the Congress.

2. The supplies and services financed by the contributions of approximately \$500,000,000 which have been made by countries other than the United States will be completely used up by the middle of March.

3. In February, March, April and May, UNRRA plans to ship more than \$700,000,000 worth of supplies from the United States, for which it does not now have the money. It is of the utmost importance that those shipments be made on time. If we can ship food and clothing quickly enough to get the people of Europe and China through the winter, and if we can deliver enough seed, fertilizer and agricultural equipment in time for the spring planting, we should be able to get these people back on their feet by fall, so that we can bring this relief operation to an end. If we do not get these supplies there in time, this year's harvest will be as bad as last year's, and we may have to continue furnishing relief indefinitely.

4. This is the crucial moment in the battle. Just as in military matters, speed is the essence of military strategy.

5. If UNRRA is to ship the \$700,000,000 worth of supplies which it has scheduled for February, March, April and May, it must have the money to order those supplies immediately. In January alone, UNRRA must furnish the procuring agencies of the United States Government—the Department of Agriculture and Treasury Procurement—with orders amounting to \$315,000,000, to be paid for out of money UNRRA does not now have. In February, it must furnish the procurement agencies with orders amounting to an additional \$254,000,000. In March, it must furnish orders amounting to \$230,000,000. That means that it must place orders exceeding \$700,000,000 within the first 3 months of next year. It cannot place those orders until it receives the money from this Congress.

6. The reason why UNRRA needs the money now for the shipments which it plans to make through next May is that it takes from 4 weeks to 4 months between the time the Government procurement agencies receive an order from UNRRA and the time that the supplies are loaded on board ship. During that period, the Government procurement agencies must find suppliers and sign contracts with them, the suppliers must obtain the goods, the goods must be shipped to port, and at the port they must be loaded on board the ships. Those things take time.

UNRRA plans to stop sending supplies to Europe at the end of December 1946, and to stop sending supplies to the Far East at the end of March 1937. Those cut-off dates

were fixed on the assumption that UNRRA would be able to supply—by this spring—the essential materials, such as seed, fertilizer, trucks and the like, which will be needed if the receiving countries are to get back on their own feet. If Congress fails to appropriate now the money which is required to carry out this program, it will truly be penny wise and pound foolish.

Mr. HAYDEN. If we must plan far ahead I am sure, as a businessman, the Senator from Minnesota will agree that authority should be given to proceed.

Mr. BALL. May I ask the Senator where the memorandum came from which he has been reading? We did not have it before the committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am merely saying that if this memorandum which has been supplied to me is correct, it would of course answer the Senator's statement.

Mr. BALL. Since within only the past few days Congress approved an appropriation of \$550,000,000, which obviously must have been committed some weeks before it was appropriated, it is perfectly evident that if UNRRA, on the basis of our authorization, goes ahead and makes its commitments on—

Mr. HAYDEN. No; this is the situation: They did not make a firm commitment to buy anything that they were not authorized to buy. They actually canceled orders which they hoped to have filled. They did not take advantage of bargains which they could have made. Moreover, they had to borrow \$50,000,000. The situation was bad. We should have made \$550,000,000 available to them some 6 weeks ago. The effect of not appropriating \$750,000,000 will be to put them right back in the same situation they were in. That is what convinced me that if we are planning to go ahead with this work it should be known how much money will be available in order that proper plans may be made. I am afraid that \$400,000,000 will not be sufficient, and I am satisfied that \$750,000,000 will be sufficient.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator was good enough to say some kind things about me a few minutes ago, and I wish to return his friendly sentiments. As he knows, I am his admirer. He has done a great deal of work on the committee. Every man on the committee wanted to do exactly what he thought was right.

The Senator will recall that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] came before the committee and recited substantially what the Senator from Arizona has said.

Mr. President, I know that the Senator from Minnesota wants this money to be used where it will do the most good. I am convinced in my own mind that the Senator will agree that the time during which it will be most needed will be between now and next April. Money will be needed in connection with planting. Seed must be made available. Those facts lead me to hope that the Senator will vote in favor of granting \$750,000,000. Whether it will be expended will depend on whether the Senate passes the bill reported by the Foreign Relations Committee. But if that bill shall be passed

we can greatly aid the people who need UNRRA's help by spending the money within the next 3 or 4 months. I hope the Senator from Minnesota will not object too strongly to the amendment.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, in view of the memorandum which the Senator from Arizona has read, which indicates that UNRRA is running out of funds and will need at least \$315,000,000 during January and \$254,000,000 during February, I would be inclined to agree that it will be doubtful if we can get an additional appropriation through Congress before March 1.

I am inclined to withdraw position which I took in the committee. I told the acting chairman of the committee, as well as all the other members of the committee, that it seemed to me to be an unusual procedure, without having a budget estimate, to appropriate more than half of a total authorization which has not yet been passed by the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. A Budget estimate was made. But the Senator has been very fair. I thank him for the position that he takes. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to give my assurance to the Senator from Minnesota, on the strength of the testimony submitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations, that if this appropriation is to be authorized at all, it is perfectly obvious that as a matter not only of good business, but as a matter of meeting the challenge which we confront in the field, it is indispensable that the major portion of the fund should be available the first few months of the next calendar year. It is perfectly apparent that the burden of human suffering is concentrated in the winter months.

Mr. McKELLAR. It certainly is.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It is equally obvious that if our objective is to put these people on a self-sustaining basis again, the burden of furnishing seed, fertilizer, elementary agricultural implements, and the like, concentrates in the spring of the year. So I am convinced from every point of view that we are completely justified in concentrating the major portion of this expenditure in these preliminary months, and in making appropriations on the basis recommended by the committee.

It seems to me that really it comes down to this: We had better stay out of UNRRA, and we had better face that naked issue in the authorization bill and defeat it rather than so crimp UNRRA under an expectation that we are going to support it that it cannot adequately meet the situation on a business basis.

Of course, we have the cart before the horse, with an appropriation ahead of the authorization—

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true, but the appropriation is dependent on the authorization.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I understand that. I think the basic issue is, Are we to support UNRRA for another year? The answer is "Yes" or "No." If the answer is "Yes," I think there can be no doubt on earth that the appropriation now requested for commitment in the early months of the next calendar year is absolutely indispensable to the plan upon which we are working.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Michigan that I wish to thank him for having made this statement, which sets forth the facts much better than I could have stated them. I wish to say to him also that last night—some time between 7 and 8 o'clock—we tried to get both the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] to come before the committee. It was a hurry-up matter, and the Senator from Michigan had already gone to his home, and for that reason we did not reach him. We would have liked to have his advice then, and I am perfectly delighted to hear what he has to say about the matter at this time.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I am very sympathetic toward the program of feeding the people in Europe who are suffering, regardless of who they are or where they are. What disturbs me about UNRRA is the reports I have received. One of the reports came to me directly from a man who was connected with UNRRA, and who served in UNRRA in Yugoslavia, and was still with UNRRA. He said that I could get the same report he was giving me from our Ambassador or Minister to Yugoslavia, whose report is now in the State Department.

He said, first of all, that Tito kept UNRRA representatives waiting in Rome for about 6 weeks while people were starving in Yugoslavia, until UNRRA would agree to turn over the distribution of the food and materials, the trucks, and whatnot, to Tito himself or to his government, and that it was finally agreed to do that, contrary to all the agreements which had been entered into by the various governments, with the understanding that the representatives of UNRRA would have a chance to go in and check up as to who was getting the materials and the food.

This man told me that when our representatives went into Yugoslavia they were unable to check up on the facts for the simple reason that they had to get permits to travel from one place to another, and that the authorities would let them go only where they wanted them to go. He said there was constant propaganda being carried on by the Tito government against the United States and against Great Britain. For instance, they were saying that while the cans of food were marked with the United States label, the food actually in the can was furnished by Russia. He said the Tito government was giving the food only to its own partisans, letting the other people starve, and would not give them food, and that some of the materials were being sold. I am extremely disturbed

about UNRRA for that reason. I think that when we are furnishing 71 percent, or whatever the amount is—

Mr. McKELLAR. Seventy-one and a fraction percent.

Mr. WHEELER. The man who made these reports to me is a reputable man, one who is now working for UNRRA, or was 2 or 3 months ago, and said he expected to continue to work for them. He told me I could get the same story he was giving me if I would get the report of our minister to Yugoslavia from the State Department.

Mr. President, if what this man told me affords a true picture of what is going on, then it seems to me it is very important that the people of the United States, who are putting up 71 percent of the money necessary to furnish food for these starving people, should at least be getting some good will out of it.

I agree that that is not the principal thing to look for in our attempt to feed these people. We want to see democratic governments established in those countries. We want to see the "four freedoms" established there, freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and the others, but if the food and the other things we are furnishing are being used in just the opposite direction—and it will be used in just the opposite direction—unless it is known that the United States is furnishing it—and unless it is going to all the people, regardless of whether or not they are Tito's partisans or are Serbians, who were Mihailovitch's followers—I do not think the people of this country want to be parties to going into a country and favoring one class, and letting one class of people profit and the other people starve. I think it is highly important that the true facts be brought out before the committee with reference to what is actually going on.

The same report came to me not only with reference to Yugoslavia, but with reference to some of the other countries. I think the matter should be thoroughly investigated in order definitely to ascertain how the food and materials are being distributed.

Frankly, I agree with the Senator from Arkansas that the relief should be distributed by the Government of the United States, just as was done after the last war. I was in Europe after the last war, and I know the United States derived a tremendous amount of good will out of what we did in feeding the people of Russia, in feeding the people of Hungary, in feeding the hungry people of Europe generally at that time. The situation is far more critical now even than it was after the last war.

Mr. President, I have a great deal of confidence in Governor Lehman, in his honesty, integrity, and ability, but if the information I have received is correct, if some of these governments are forcing us to turn the materials over to them, and they are selling a part of them, that knowledge should be brought home to our people. The information with reference to what was going on in Yugoslavia and Bulgaria came to some of us when we were in Rome from newspapermen who had just been in those countries. It came to us from intelligent, responsible people from all over Europe.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator wish to comment on what has just been stated?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wish to make a comment in response to what has been said by the Senator from Montana.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wish to say a word particularly in view of my previous statement. I would not want what I previously said to indicate for an instant that the UNRRA record is satisfactory, either from my own standpoint or from the standpoint of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I think there is very serious doubt in the minds of all of us about some of the phases of UNRRA.

I wish to say in mitigation, however, that it is to be remembered that this organization had to be hastily thrown together in the face of a world calamity and that it was probably utterly impossible to anticipate that in its first year of operations, and no matter what the auspices which operated it, it would run into doubtful situations upon many occasions. I think a number of those difficulties have now been corrected. I specifically inquired during the hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee whether relief in a given country went to those who required it, or only to the political partisans of the governments in control, and the assurance was given us that it went to all now, although I think it is quite clear that in many instances in the initial stages of the operation that was not true.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, the Senator is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. Let me ask him if he has ever received a report concerning what went on in Yugoslavia from our minister in Yugoslavia?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No; I have not seen such a report.

Mr. WHEELER. A man who works for UNRRA came to me and told me of the situation in Yugoslavia. For obvious reasons he did not want his name known. He was sent to me by a very reputable individual in this city, to tell me the story, and I think he told it to other Senators. He said that our own minister in Yugoslavia had sent a report to the State Department. I wish the Foreign Relations Committee at least would ask for the report which was made by our Minister to Yugoslavia. If the things that are reported to be going on are true, then certainly we ought not to turn money over to other governments so they may feed it out to their own partisans, and permit those who do not agree with them to starve to death. The horrible conditions that this man who works for UNRRA told me existed in Yugoslavia were, to say the least, blood curdling.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If there is any such evidence as that available, I say to the Senator that I agree with him and that it ought to be scrupulously explored, and undoubtedly that can be done. Governor Lehman, in his appearance before our committee, was very frank in conceding many of the difficulties which he confronted. He confronted black-market operations in many instances, but he pointed to the fact, with some right of

pride, I think, that only 13 or 14 employees out of 8,000 so far as the UNRRA personnel itself was concerned, had been found guilty of black-market operations.

All I am saying in response to the Senator from Montana is that I think there is a very substantial background of justification for complaint. I think the overwhelming opinion of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is that the termination dates for UNRRA indicated in this second appropriation bill, mean exactly what they say.

Mr. WHEELER. Speaking of black-market operations, I should like to say that we saw evidences of them when we were in Athens. At a time when American housewives had difficulty in buying certain canned goods in this country, one could go into the stores in Athens and buy such canned goods. The goods were advertised in the stores, and could be bought there. How they got into those stores I do not know. The goods could not be bought in America, or very rarely could be; but similar goods could be bought in Paris, they could be bought in Rome, and in other cities.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I suppose it would be impossible for an international organization of this nature to operate this international adventure in war-torn Europe, under the stress and strain of circumstances that are almost beyond description or definition, in the absence of any established legal government in most instances, surrounded at all times by the pull and haul of Europe's power politics—

Mr. McKELLAR. And frequently by revolution or near revolution.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Oh, yes. I doubt whether you could hope for a more efficient result than has been obtained.

All I want to say is that I think we are caught on the horns of a dilemma. Unless UNRRA is permitted adequately to function during this next period in this suffering area, I do not know what is going to happen, except that misery will multiply into chaos and chaos into anarchy. And since the record, believe me, has its assets as well as its liabilities—and let us not for an instant overlook that—I think there is no alternative except to proceed for another year. There can be no doubt on earth about the good faith of the general management of UNRRA and its high dedication and high purpose.

In my opinion, unless the situation is vastly changed at the end of another year I, certainly so far as I am concerned, intend that the dates fixed in the pending authorization for the termination of UNRRA shall mean exactly what they say. And if there is any necessity beyond those dates for a continuation of this operation, my present feeling is that it should proceed precisely as indicated by the Senator from Montana, under our own American auspices.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I will answer very briefly the statement made by my good friend from Montana. He said that a gentleman told him that our Minister to Yugoslavia had reported on these conditions.

Mr. WHEELER. The one who gave me the story was himself a representative of UNRRA.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator from Montana had told that to the committee the other day when he was down there, I as acting chairman would certainly have had this official brought before the committee. But we did not have any specific proof respecting that particular country.

I want to say that I had heard the same reports that the Senator had heard. Therefore, yesterday I offered this amendment in committee, which the committee rejected:

That no part of this appropriation, and no supplies or other property procured with this appropriation, shall be available to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration until such Administration has furnished to the President assurances found by him to be adequate and satisfactory to insure that this appropriation will be used only for providing food, clothing, and other relief to distressed or needy persons, without charge, and for paying such administrative and other expenses as are necessarily identical to furnishing such relief.

My purpose in offering the amendment was to take care of the very suggestions that were made. The committee voted down the amendment. I was sorry the committee did so.

I want to thank the Senator from Montana for the statement he has made, for the reason that with the publicity that is going out Governor Lehman and UNRRA will be obliged to exercise the greatest care and the greatest industry in seeing to it that the purposes of the Senate and the House are carried out with reference to this appropriation. So I hope the Senate will vote for the larger amount, \$750,000,000.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I wish the Senator would offer now on the floor of the Senate the amendment which was rejected by the committee, because I think it would probably be adopted on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am embarrassed about the matter, for the reason that if ever there was a splendid subcommittee it was the committee which handled this matter. Not all members of the subcommittee are present this afternoon. That committee certainly worked faithfully and well, and without regard to party, without regard to faction. They were simply excellent men all trying to do their duty, and they outvoted me, and naturally I feel diffident about offering the amendment under those circumstances. The Senator from Montana can readily understand that.

Mr. WHEELER. I understand the Senator's position. I have a great deal of respect for the members of the subcommittee which handled this matter. I might say to the Senator respecting the report which was made to me by this gentleman who is working for UNRRA, that I myself intended to write a letter to the State Department about it, but in the press of business I completely forgot about it, and I had forgotten about it until this discussion arose this afternoon.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am very glad the Senator brought it up on the floor of the Senate because it will make those man-

aging UNRRA very much more careful, I hope.

Mr. WHEELER. I got the story of black-market operations in Athens from soldiers, GI boys, and from newspapermen, and I got the story of mismanagement from many others. In fact we got the same story nearly everywhere we went. I agree that UNRRA was in an exceedingly difficult situation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; it was.

Mr. WHEELER. Because of the tremendously difficult conditions which existed all over Europe. I am the last one who wants to see suffering women and children, whether friends or foes, starve to death, because after all, as General Eisenhower said, children have no nationality. I cannot help but feel that we have adopted a very poor policy with reference to the children in Central Europe who are starving to death. I cannot bring myself to be vindictive enough to permit women and children to die, even though their governments were our enemies. I cannot stand idly by and permit them to die.

If they are in central Europe, that will affect the whole economy not only of central Europe, but of every single country on the European Continent. If this condition persists it will mean that we shall drive those people to a philosophy and ideology which is directly opposed to everything we stand for in the United States.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I merely wish to make it clear, in view of the fact that I began by opposing this increase in the amount, that I have supported UNRRA. I still support it. I believe that the Senator from Michigan is correct. After all, an international organization depends upon the cooperation of individual nations and governments. It has no operating force of its own. We cannot expect it to operate with real efficiency, any more than war can be conducted with efficiency. Both operations are wasteful and inefficient.

But we had absolutely no evidence before the Appropriations Committee last night on this question. I had heard some of the same reports to which the Senator from Montana has referred. It seemed to me wise to give the organization enough to carry it through until the committee could call witnesses and try to put a little more pressure on the administration of UNRRA to take a firmer stand with governments in one or two places which insist upon using the distribution of UNRRA supplies for political purposes. I am afraid that that sort of thing is going on. I had hoped that we could take a look at that question early next year. But the figures presented by the Senator from Arizona, with whom I have cooperated in the committee in an effort to avoid riders which would in effect tie the funds up and make the appropriations meaningless, convinced me that we need the larger sum, and, therefore, I am supporting the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

In conclusion, Mr. President, let me read the names of the members of the Subcommittee on Deficiency Appropriations. I have never known any com-

mittee to work more faithfully. Unhappily, two of the members of the subcommittee could not be present. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] was ill and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] was engaged in another committee. He was present at the full committee meeting, but not at the meeting of the Subcommittee on Deficiency Appropriations.

The names of the subcommittee members are as follows: The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. As I recall, most of the members of the subcommittee were present every day, and I never saw members of a committee perform more yeoman service. Irrespective of party, they tried to be fair and just in all the undertakings before the committee.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, frankly, I do not know how the acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], stood up under the hearings on the bill. I forget how many score witnesses we heard. He sat through the hearings, from 10 o'clock in the morning often until 5:30 or 6 o'clock in the evening, and last night until after 7.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement. First, I desire to commend the able Senators who have extolled the virtues of Governor Lehman. I felt that before the debate concluded I would like to take the floor and do so myself, but it has been done better by other Senators.

Let me say to the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] that his explanation of the difficulties which beset UNRRA has been presented to us on numerous occasions. The other evening the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and I attended a 2-hour forum on this subject, at which time Governor Lehman's chief deputy was present to present the case of UNRRA.

I would vote for the proposal now pending if there were nothing else to it than provision for the care of needy people of the Old World. America has always been charitable, and will always be generous in its treatment of stricken people the world over. Certainly, the humanitarian aspects of this case have been brought out very vividly and very effectively; but there is another side to the case which I believe is worth a brief moment in this debate.

Much of this money will be spent in the United States. During the past several months we have been busily engaged, in the special committee of which I am chairman, in the consideration of the expeditious sale of Government surpluses.

This agency will take Government surpluses in this country and abroad, and in return pay the Army or the surplus-property agency in the American dollars which we are today appropriating for that purpose.

I attended a number of meetings called by the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. I also attended a number of meetings on the House side, called by those interested in agriculture. By reason of the very marked cut-back in military contracts for agricultural commodities many hardships are developing throughout the United States. We have an enormous potato crop in Maine, Idaho, New York, and other States. We appealed to Governor Lehman. Much of this money will be used to relieve the situation in agriculture in the United States.

We might in some way or other succeed in surviving in a sick world; but I doubt very much whether we could attain full employment or be able to sell our goods in a sick world. So it is to our advantage that we take an added interest in the situation which brings this legislation before the Senate for consideration this afternoon. I merely wished to express the thought that there is some self-interest in this legislation, in addition to the humanitarian aspects which have been so appropriately presented.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have not heretofore participated in this debate, but I hope the Senate will indulge me for a very short time.

As between the original item in the committee amendment of \$400,000,000 and the amendment providing for an appropriation of \$750,000,000, it seems to me that it would be wiser to adopt the figure of \$750,000,000 than the figure of \$400,000,000. If we adopt the authorization of \$1,350,000,000, we shall certainly spend at least \$750,000,000 of that authorization before this program is completed. So there is no reason why we should not appropriate the amount which has been requested by the President of the United States.

Some reflection has been cast upon the Committee on Foreign Relations. We do not arrogate to ourselves the degree of perfection to which other Senators have referred. The committee is endeavoring to perform its duty to the Congress, to the Senate, and to the country.

A hearing was scheduled before the Committee on Foreign Relations, and there were present a group of 8 or 10 appearing in behalf of UNRRA. The group included Governor Lehman; Dean Acheson, the Under Secretary of State; and others.

There is no question that there are errors of administration in UNRRA. In my mind there is no question that there is a great deal of waste and inefficiency in its administration. No doubt some of the complaints which the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] mentions are justified. But, Mr. President, the first automobile that was ever built was not the latest model Cadillac. We cannot start a world-wide organization such as this, from the very initial stages, and expect it to tick like the Swiss watch which I hold in my hand. I believe that

Governor Lehman is entirely honest and conscientious, and is doing the best he can. Probably he is lacking in some of the qualities of leadership and administration, but I believe that he is doing the best he can.

Mr. President, if this were an initial proposal, with the light which I now have, and which I did not have before, I would favor a strictly American relief project, to be financed by the Government of the United States and administered entirely by the United States. But we are not faced with that problem. We have already passed that problem, because we have entered into an international organization and international convention to participate in the organization and contribute certain funds.

It was clear in the hearings, from Governor Lehman and others, that it would be absolutely physically impossible for this Government, through its own employees, to administer the distribution of relief in all the nations where UNRRA is operating. To do so would require an army of employees. As it is, there are 8,000 employees. If we should undertake to administer relief in each country, in every village, and every locality, with representatives going there and maintaining warehouses, transportation, and things of that kind, many more thousands of employees would be required. That was one of the complaints in the committee about the organization, namely, that too much of it was being eaten up in salaries, some of which were rather large.

Mr. President, that is the situation. When we extend relief in a particular country, if we do not do it ourselves, who is there to do it, except the governmental authorities of that country? The Senator from Montana has told us what some man told him, but he did not tell us who the man was. He said the man is working for UNRRA. If he is working for UNRRA he should tell Governor Lehman about these difficulties. He should not slip off and whisper into some Senator's ear. He should go to his chieftain and point it out and have him correct it, instead of trying to cause dissension regarding the organization. If it be true, I condemn it as heartily as did the Senator from Montana. But we do not know the man's name or anything about him. He was not present at the hearings, and in the hearings no one told us about these matters. The Senator from Montana did not honor us with his presence. So, Mr. President, the committee feels no compunctions about not having heard what the Senator from Montana has referred to.

The situation is that we have embarked on this enterprise. We can either finish it and make the appropriation of \$1,350,000,000 or we can stop. This legislation warns the world that this program will end in Europe on December 31, 1946, and in the East, in Asia, on March 31, 1947. It is said that because we ourselves are not administering this relief, we are not getting any credit for it. There is no doubt that there is much merit in that claim; I do not dispute that. It is an international organization, and no doubt the governments which

are distributing the relief create the impression, in at least some cases, that they are the ones who are contributing the money. I am sure the Senator from Montana will remember that when the WPA was operating in this country there were charges that it was used for political purposes; there were charges that it was ill-administered. I have no doubt that in many instances it was ill-administered, and I have no doubt that in some instances it was used for purposes of political influence. I do not question those things.

But we are dealing with realities. We are not living in a dream world. We are living in a world which has been cursed by the scourge of war. In many parts of Europe misery and suffering exists. We cannot pick out some of the unfortunates and say to them, "We will feed you," and say to others, "We will not feed you." We must trust someone. If we require those who are charged with the administration of the organization to do their duty fairly and properly, we shall have done the best we can do.

I wish to point out that we impressed upon Governor Lehman the necessity of making sure, insofar as possible, that in all the countries in which UNRRA relief is furnished the distributing agents, whether Government agencies or others, should carry out the distribution in accordance with the purposes and aims which are written into the act, according to the purposes and aims which are animating our people, who are extending so lavishly this humanitarian aid and relief.

Mr. President, it is true that we shall not get the entire credit for it. Many persons in many countries will be angry at us when the relief is terminated. They will be angry because it is not more lavish, and some of them will be angry because they get a rump steak instead of a porterhouse steak or a sirloin steak. But we cannot help that. We know that those who knock at our back doors for help, and get it, on the second application expect it and on the third application demand it.

Mr. President, those things should be taken at their face value. It is true that many of the people will hate us. They will forget the gift. They will forget that we have extended aid to them in their time of need. Very well; we have had evidence of that before. We have had evidence of that in the case of the camps which have been maintained in Germany for displaced persons. Some of the displaced persons will not leave the camps in which they are now located and return to the homes from which they were evicted or from which they fled because they are content to remain in the camps and to be fed and housed by the United States of America. That is the problem which we shall have to face throughout the administration of this act.

Mr. President, as I view the situation, the Senate is going to adopt one of these items, either the one providing \$400,000,000 or the one providing \$750,000,000. I think it wise to adopt the one providing \$750,000,000. I think the intelligent world will understand the attitude of the

United States. Every recipient in Europe may not feel indebted to the American people; but this is one of the handsomest and most magnanimous acts of any government in the history of the human race. The United States is reaching down into its depleted Treasury and is borrowing money, and paying interest on it, to accumulate \$2,700,000,000, an amount which up to this time would have astounded the world. The United States will hand that money over for the relief of the suffering people of Europe and Asia—a magnanimous act. If there ever was a national good Samaritan, the United States is entitled to that appellation.

Mr. President, in the light of history, I think we shall not be ashamed that we have done this. If some of these funds are misappropriated, I shall regret it. If some of the people in Europe who are hungry are not fed, I shall be sorry.

We can do this thing. We can do the best we can; and, as the act says, we serve warning on all the peoples of the earth that they may expect the termination of this system on the 31st of December 1946 in the case of Europe, and on the 31st of March 1947 in the case of Asia.

Mr. President, in brief, those are my sentiments. I wish to say that the Committee on Foreign Relations unanimously reported the authorization. At that meeting of the committee not all its members were present; but those who were there and those who held the hearing and those who interrogated the witnesses reached that conclusion.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator a question. In the committee hearings was consideration given to the subject of feeding the nationals of Germany who are in the part of Germany now occupied by American forces? I have in mind the little children and the old men and women who are there. Or does the act continue to provide that only displaced persons may be fed and aided?

Before the Senator answers the question, I wish to say that probably I have as much reason to feel bitter toward our enemies in this war as does any person in this Chamber. I lost my only son in the war. But if I were to let that make me so bitter that I would attempt to take vengeance by letting little children and men and women on one side of the street starve while I contributed shelter and food and clothing to those on the other side of the street, I would be ashamed of myself.

The other day I said in this Chamber that if we continue to do that or if we overlook such a situation and simply stand on the side of the road, I believe it will be a blot on our national escutcheon for all time.

Mr. President, my question to the Senator from Texas is whether his committee gave consideration to the feeding of these people who had no responsibility for the war; did the committee consider the question of having the UNRRA feed

them if and when the Army ceases to feed them? I know the Army is supposed to be feeding them today.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that the committee did not recommend any basic changes in the original act. I do not have a copy of the act before me, but my recollection is that the original act forbids UNRRA to engage in any activities in any enemy territory occupied by Allied troops. As I recall, in the case of Germany, for instance, that means that the Army is now feeding a great many German people. When the Army discontinues that activity, I am of the impression, although I am not sure about this, that UNRRA might then undertake it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. As I recall the testimony before the Appropriations Committee in regard to the last \$550,000,000 appropriation which was made several days ago, it was stated that the original agreement between the United Nations carried the proviso referred to by the Senator from Texas, namely, that no UNRRA aid would be extended in the case of nationals of the Axis Powers. That restriction has since been modified; and UNRRA is now operating in Italy, and it is proposed to have it operate in Austria.

In a report of the Foreign Relations Committee on this new authorization for the second increment of \$1,350,000,000, there is no mention made of Germany. Here is the gist of the report:

Part of the additional 1 percent contribution will be used to continue UNRRA's existing operations in Greece, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Albania, China, and Italy. The remainder will be devoted to taking over the extensive relief operations which are now being carried on in Italy by the American, British, and Canadian armies, and to furnish supplies and services to several new areas in which UNRRA has authorized an administration to operate.

Those areas are Austria, a part of Russia, the Ukraine, which is a large part of Russia, Formosa, and Korea.

Nowhere in the report is Germany mentioned, and nothing in the testimony indicated that aid would be extended to Germany. As a matter of fact, Mr. Clayton testified that there was no intention of operating within Germany except insofar as relief might be given to the nationals of other countries who are temporarily in Germany in the camps to which the Senator from Texas has referred.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator very much for his statement. The testimony before the committee discloses that the allocations which are to be made in the future are all tentative, and subject to readjustment.

Mr. RUSSELL. A resolution adopted by the Supreme Council of UNRRA would be required before any of those funds could be expended in Germany.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is correct. If, in the event conditions in Germany develop in such a way that it is felt wise to extend the operations of UNRRA into Germany, I am sure that the Supreme Council of UNRRA has authority under the agreement to do so.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I had occasion to look into this matter. I saw a notice in one of the newspapers to the effect that large operations would be carried on in Italy. I recall that when the bill was originally pending it was stated on the floor of the Senate that operations would not be conducted in any country that had been our enemy during the war. It now appears that a considerable portion of this new authorization is to be used in Italy. I may say to the Senator from New Jersey that I have not been able to understand why that has been done. So far as I am concerned in considering this matter, the only difference between Germany and Italy, is that Italy's efforts to kill our men during the war were not very effective, whereas Germany's efforts were considerably effective.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I join with the Senator from Texas in thanking the Senator from Georgia for the information and light he has thrown on the subject.

I wish to ask the Senator from Texas if he does not think there should be more than the right in UNRRA's board of directors to change the situation? Does not the Senator believe that the Government of the United States should put itself on record in that regard?

Mr. CONNALLY. When the authorization bill comes before the Senate the Senator from New Jersey may offer an amendment along that line.

Mr. HAWKES. I know that the Senator will agree with me that it is not customary to ask for an appropriation of money before the bill authorizing the appropriation is passed.

Mr. CONNALLY. The appropriation provides that it shall not become effective unless the authorization is made.

Mr. HAWKES. That is true. I am very definitely in favor of increasing the amount to \$750,000,000, because time is of the essence of everything in connection with this matter. There is no use of appropriating the money next April after the funeral has been held. In other words, what we do should be done with as much soundness and speed as we can give to it. I agree with the Senator from Texas that we should not expect perfection in connection with this matter. It is impossible to throw a great organization together under the conditions which UNRRA must operate.

I also believe that what the Senator from Montana has said contains valuable suggestions and a great deal of sense. I think it will cause the persons who are operating UNRRA to sit up and take notice, and see that some of the things which are being criticized are corrected.

But, in connection with the \$750,000,000 as related to the \$400,000,000, I believe that the appropriation should now be made to apply to all citizens in distress in the countries where we are granting relief either through the Army or UNRRA. I also feel that this great body should see that proper consideration is given to the innocent children, the older men and women, and the needy in those foreign countries, before the winter has passed. I know from first-hand information, as many other Members of the Senate know, that terrible conditions exist in Ger-

many and in Italy. We also know that thousands of people in those countries are on the verge of starvation and freezing to death. Time is of the essence of successful relief.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from New Jersey. I am sure that I voice the sentiments of all members of the Senate when I express our sympathy to him on account of the death of his son in the late war. What we may say to him will not assuage his grief, but he must take great pride in knowing that his son died a heroic death in fighting for the honor and integrity of his country.

Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey has stated that there is a great lack of food in Germany. There has been considerable conflict of opinion in regard to that point. I have talked to many persons who have been in Germany, such as officers and others, and they have stated to me that in the country districts there is plenty of food. I do not mean that there is a surplus of food, but there is sufficient food to take care of the needs of the people in the country districts, and they are getting along very satisfactorily. However, because of a lack of transportation and distribution that situation is not true in regard to the cities. The testimony before the committee was that in the country districts sufficient food is to be had. I may say that a report of a similar nature comes to me with respect largely to Italy. I doubt not, however, that there is suffering, hunger, and starvation in both of those countries as well as in the other countries which have been referred to in the debate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I shall speak for only a few minutes.

I do not know where the distinguished Senator from Texas got the idea that the Foreign Relations Committee was being criticized. Certainly it was not being criticized by me.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. Brooks] made the statement to which I referred.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know what some other Senator said.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not denominate the Senator from Montana. If he wants me to be more particular, I will say that I had more reference to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. WHEELER. Nothing which I said could be construed as being the slightest criticism of the Foreign Relations Committee, because I did not know what its position had been. I merely asked the Senator from Michigan whether or not consideration had been given to the Minister of Yugoslavia who, I understood, would confirm everything that had been told me by my informant. The Senator from Texas said that I had reported the name of someone and stated that that person should go to his chief. Whether that person had reported to his chief, I do not know, but I am assuming that his chief knew all about the situation. He certainly knew whether or not people had been kept waiting in a row for 6 weeks while other persons were starving in Yugoslavia. And certainly he knew whether or not

food had been allowed to be turned over to Tito contrary to every agreement which had been entered into by the various nations involved that food would not be handled in that way.

Under the UNRRA agreement, as I understand it, food was not to be turned over to any government to be distributed wherever it saw fit, but it was to be distributed by the representatives of UNRRA. I did not call the matter to the attention of the Foreign Relations Committee, because, as I said a moment ago, I had completely forgotten what this man had said to me about the situation until the discussion arose, and, secondly, I did not know when the Foreign Relations Committee was going to take up the matter. I merely suggested that I thought, and I still think, that the food should be distributed by the Government of the United States, and that it should not be turned over to some government, whether it be Tito's government or some other government, to be distributed only to partisans of that government or its particular pets, and used for political purposes. That is not the reason why the Congress voted money to help needy persons in foreign countries. I voted for the previous appropriation and I intend to vote for the one now proposed. But I believe that the taxpayers of the United States would be opposed to turning money over to a particular group in any country for the purpose of distributing food to partisans of the government which may happen to be in power, or distributed by a government which may not legally be in power. That would not be charity and it would be taking sides in the internal affairs of another country. It would be wrong morally, and it would be wrong from the standpoint of the understanding which the people had when their representatives voted for UNRRA and the preceding appropriations.

We all know that the only way in which we can get facts, the only way Senators can ascertain conditions, is by someone coming to us and telling us what goes on in the departments. That is the only way we get facts in many of the investigations which are carried on. If people could not come to us and tell us these things, corruption would exist in some of the departments, and we would never know anything about it. The only reports we get before the committees come from those who give the good side and do not tell anything about the other side.

I repeat, Mr. President, I am glad to hear the Senator from Michigan say that when this provision expires, if help shall be needed in these countries, he, for one, will vote to see that the United States Government distributes the food and that we shall derive whatever good will we deserve from the relief which is afforded.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, can we not have a vote now?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if the Senator will give me about 2 minutes, I should like to say a word.

The Senator from Montana has raised a serious question about the administration of the UNRRA funds. Naturally, abuses have occurred in many countries

in which they were distributed, but in the last few weeks I have visited some of those countries, and I know that in one country in the Balkans the UNRRA authorities have given a directive to the local government that if they did not change and improve and make more efficient the administration of the funds, the funds would be withheld from that country. So that I think UNRRA is on the alert to see that the local governments do not for political purposes improperly administer the funds.

In the case of Yugoslavia, to which the able Senator from Montana referred, I may say that during the month of October I happened for about 3 days to be in Belgrade, where I talked to the British and American representatives of UNRRA. I did not hear, either from them or from our Ambassador in that country, that there was any abuse on the part of governmental authorities in the administration of the funds, certainly no more than what would normally occur.

On the other hand, in their hearts those people, who cannot speak to the Congress, I know would like to say how grateful they are for the funds which are being principally provided by the United States. They do know it. They know that seventy-odd percent, or the majority of this money, comes from the United States.

In Rome I talked with the head of the whole UNRRA in Europe, and he said, "If there is anything I should like to transmit to the American Congress as a message it is that, whatever funds they are going to give us—and we pray they will be the same we had last year—should be provided promptly so that we may know what we can count on and can make arrangements for our purchases and our plans for the use of the funds in the most efficient way."

The President has recommended that the amount of the authorization, \$1,350,000,000, be appropriated by the Congress. Mr. Will Clayton, for whom I have great respect, and of whom my opinion is constantly improving, committed us in London to the \$1,350,000,000, and if it had not been a sound proposal I do not think he would have made that commitment for us.

The House of Representatives has already passed an authorization of \$1,350,000,000, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations unanimously has reported to the Senate the authorization of \$1,350,000,000, and now I cannot see anything to be gained, if we intend to appropriate \$1,350,000,000, by making available only \$400,000,000. I do not see what is to be gained by that, and I am sure it would work out injuriously to the efficiency of the program. I certainly wish to add my one voice to those who will support the Senator from Tennessee in his amendment.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will speedily adopt the amendment. I wish to read to the Senate a letter I have received from Dr. Arthur E. Morgan, former chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, a great American, which gives information which in

my judgment is accurate regarding conditions in Europe today. He says:

DEAR SENATOR EASTLAND: I have some direct information on food conditions in Europe which I hope you will read personally. It supports the statements made in the attached report from five international organizations in Switzerland.

The five international organizations were five international church organizations, which have had representatives in Europe securing first-hand information of conditions in all the countries in the stricken area. Dr. Morgan continues:

First, as to infant mortality, which in some areas reaches 100 percent. My neighbor, Dr. Lester W. Sontag, director of the Fels fund for child study, has just returned from Italy where he went to study famine conditions. He says that with the extreme undernourishment prevailing in many places, emaciated mothers have no milk for babies as they are born, and there being no milk supply, the babies necessarily die.

Second, my son-in-law, Landrum Bolling, has returned from investigations in Austria, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary, where he got about as few other men have. In Austria, for instance, he found Gen. Mark Clark struggling to raise the diet from 900 to 1,500 calories a day.

Third, on two occasions recently I have visited the starvation experiments now being concluded at Minnesota State University. This group of men, carefully selected for health and vigor, and with all other conditions comfortable, were reduced to skin and bones by a diet of 1,700 calories a day. They do not begin to recover on 2,000 calories.

Mr. President, even though the appropriation which is sought for UNRRA will not relieve starvation in Germany, our Army in our zone is attempting to furnish only 1,500 calories a day, when this country has ample supplies to relieve starvation there, and in the Russian areas, my information is, there reside 22,000,000 people today, with sufficient food for only 4,000,000. The Russians have no food, and if they had the food they would not have the transports in which to deliver it in order to relieve starvation. In my judgment, the American Government must ship in food and exert every effort to relieve starvation in the stricken areas.

I read further from Dr. Morgan's letter:

A diet of 3,000 to 3,500 calories is necessary to bring recovery. Germany is being held to 1,500 calories.

Fourth, Clarence Pickett, director of the American Friends Service Committee, tells me from his first-hand examination in Europe, that, in his opinion, present American policies are driving Germany directly to communism. Do not General Eisenhower's statements say the same thing in more diplomatic language?

Europe has been greatly disillusioned with communism and will turn to America if we act wisely. Food for starving people is the first key. Humanity and selfish policy unite in calling for prompt help on a large scale.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR E. MORGAN.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD there be printed an editorial from the Yellow Springs News, of Yellow Springs, Ohio, which gives the report of the five international church organizations on conditions in central Europe.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL GROUP PLEADS FOR RELIEF SUPPLIES

An urgent appeal for relief supplies to prevent the threatened death of millions of children in Europe was recently issued by five international organizations, in conference in Berne, Switzerland. The groups were the World Council of Churches, the World Jewish Congress, Caritas, which is the International Catholic Welfare agency, the International Committee of the Red Cross, and the Save the Children International Union. "Children by the millions are in imminent danger of starving and freezing as winter comes to Europe," the joint statement said, "unless immediate help comes from countries which have food, clothing, vitamins, and medicines."

Stressing that "helpless children cannot survive much longer unless there is a united effort to help them," the appeal declared that "every official, humanitarian, and religious agency must come to the rescue immediately or it will be too late."

The agencies said they welcomed present efforts of governments and national and international groups, and urged generous public support of all organizations willing to cooperate in the "dire emergency now confronting Europe."

"We pledge ourselves to work together in meeting needs without regard to nationality, race or creed," the signers promised, adding that "only by immediate and coordinated effort can colossal catastrophe be avoided."

Dr. Sylvester C. Michelfelder of Toledo, Ohio, newly appointed director of the new Division of Material Aid in the Department of Reconstruction and Inter-Church Aid of the World Council of Churches, estimated that 13,000,000 would die in Europe this winter unless help comes, and that one-third or one-half of these victims would be children.

Father Alois Stegerwald, of Lucerne, representing Caritas, recalled that Catholics helped 10,000 Belgian, Dutch, French, and other children to find refuge in Switzerland and now desire to do a similar work of mercy for the suffering of Germany and Central Europe.

Father Stegerwald added that a report just received by him says that all children between the Oder and Neisse Rivers under 2 years of age have already died. "We must help at the earliest moment," he said, "because it may be too late in the spring."

As documentary support of their appeal, the five groups released a carefully compiled report portraying the conditions which children face from France to Russia. The report included the following facts:

Near Salzburg, there are 60,000 children, and in the rest of Austria, 150,000, of various nationalities, herded in camps without sufficient food, clothing, and medical care.

In Vienna, 18,000 infants under 12 months suffer from lack of milk and clothing, and the infant mortality rate has increased from 6 percent in 1943 to 15 percent today.

In Budapest, most children below 1 year of age died during the siege of the city, but the situation has been remedied to the extent that now only one of four babies dies.

In Yugoslavia, children who look like skeletons and are covered with lice have diseases which doctors met before only in books. They eat roots, leaves, and nuts. Some of their parents have no clothing and plow naked at night.

In Greece, with more than 30,000 orphans, children in 'teens often care for families of five and six younger children.

In Albania, half of the nursing mothers cannot feed their babies. The usual diet of these infants consists of a pap concocted of bread and water.

In Germany, at Eberswald and Neuruppin, the infant mortality rate is 100 percent. At Prenzlau, four of five babies born this year and last are dead. At Goettingen, the milk ration for children is one pint daily, and half that in other areas.

George Thelin, general secretary of the Save the Children Union at Geneva, said that 400,000 children in Poland have lost both parents and that 700,000 others lost one.

"It is easy to imagine," the report said, "the situation of children and babies in territory where, according to a recent account from Frankfurt, 5,000,000 refugees are wandering and live by theft and plunder, taking food of people who themselves do not have enough."

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, speaking for myself personally, and I hope I represent the views of a number of Senators present, it seems to me we are not approaching this problem with the seriousness and the efficiency that its magnitude requires. It seems to me we are acting wholly on the impulse of a great emotion. That emotion, which is shared by all the people of our country, moves us to believe we can do something to relieve the suffering and hunger of the women and the children of Europe.

We have all been disturbed during the last several months by reports of inefficiency in the operation of UNRRA. We were told, when some protested the appropriation of the additional sum of \$550,000,000, that this would all be reviewed when the time came for the appropriation of the larger sum, or second commitment of \$1,350,000,000. Some of us, acting upon that assurance, voted for the \$550,000,000 item.

Now we are asked to appropriate, first, \$400,000,000, and now to increase that to \$750,000,000, which is a great sum when we compare it with the enormous burden which has been laid upon the American people. We have an obligation to think of the people of America who will have to pay for this expenditure. We have an obligation to see that the money is administered in a faithful and in an efficient manner at the places where the American people desire relief be given. Therefore at this time, when we are concerned about this distribution, why is it that we are voting this immense sum without a thorough canvass of what UNRRA is doing, without a diligent effort to help UNRRA and to correct its mistakes so that it may carry out the wishes of the American people as effectively and as economically as possible, so that the relief may be distributed as far as possible.

Now we are told that the Foreign Relations Committee has reported the measure authorizing this \$1,350,000,000. We are in effect here, as Senators representing our several States, being advised to vote for the appropriation now proposed on the strength of the statement that the authorization bill has been reported by the Foreign Relations Committee, after only a very brief study. We have not had any opportunity to study the report of the Foreign Relations Committee. We have not had opportunity to examine the evidence which was adduced before that committee. I

can see no reason why this whole appropriation cannot be laid over, to come up along with the consideration of the authorization measure. We are, it seems to me, acting in a very inefficient and very irregular way in making this huge appropriation of the people's money when we have not thoroughly examined the basis for it. Now we are told that if we will take the \$1,350,000,000 which will be provided for the hungry people of the world and scatter and distribute it around, if it does not do the job, we will not give them another cent.

We all know, however, that when the time comes a year from now when we will be told "The job is not done in Europe; more money is needed to carry out this program; UNRRA is the only agency which can do it, and therefore an additional appropriation must be made," we will then be asked to vote a further appropriation. This is a continuing job, Mr. President. This is not the end of it.

So I move that this appropriation be laid aside for the present so that it may be considered and the whole subject reviewed in connection with the authorization measure, so that the whole matter may be completed at one time, without delaying the aid which we wish to give to these people. That would be the orderly and proper manner in which this subject should be handled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee to the committee amendment, in line 1, on page 7, to strike out \$400,000,000 and insert \$750,000,000.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, we have concluded action on six pages of the bill and I note there are 65 pages in it. I should suppose it would be utterly impossible to conclude action on the bill this evening, and I wonder if this would not be an appropriate time to recess.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the Senator from Maine is correct. It would be impossible to complete the bill this evening. I shall ask that the Senate recess now until tomorrow at 12 o'clock, and I want to express the very great hope that Senators will be present so that we may finish action on the bill as soon as possible tomorrow.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, if I may say a further word, I am in complete sympathy with the desire of the Senator from Tennessee, that Members may be present tomorrow so that we may make progress on this bill. If there is to be a Christmas recess beginning at a time which makes it possible for many Members to go to their homes, it is necessary that we put on pressure and gather speed in the termination of the program between now, and let us say, the 21st of December. So I hope, as does the Senator from Tennessee, that the Members of the Senate will be present tomorrow and will stay with the session in the further hope that we may conclude the passage of the bill tomorrow.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope so.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from attendance on the Senate all of next week, a part of the time to attend the meeting of the American Bar Association at Cincinnati, Ohio, and the remainder of it to make a visit to my home State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Missouri is granted.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON, D. C.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lynn U. Stambaugh, of North Dakota, to be a member, Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, D. C., for a term expiring June 30, 1950.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Foreign Service.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Foreign Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Foreign Service nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Saturday, December 15, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 14 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Clarence E. Gauss, of Connecticut, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, District of Columbia, for a term expiring June 30, 1950.

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Seybourn H. Lynne, of Alabama, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Alabama, vice Thomas A. Murphy, deceased.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

Capt. Louis L. Bennett, United States Coast Guard, to be a commodore, for temporary service in the Coast Guard, to rank from the 1st day of November 1945, while serving as commanding officer of Coast Guard training station, Groton, Conn., or in any other assignment for which the rank of commodore is authorized.

Capt. Joseph E. Stika, United States Coast Guard, to be a commodore, for temporary service in the Coast Guard, to rank from the 1st day of November 1945, while serving as commanding officer of the Coast Guard group, Alameda, Calif., or in any other assignment for which the rank of commodore is authorized.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be Postmasters:

ARKANSAS

Arthur M. Matthews, Alicia, Ark., in place of F. W. Lemay, resigned.

Fred G. Williams, Bismarck, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Barbara L. Payne, Patmos, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

CALIFORNIA

Lilburn G. Rice, Upper Lake, Calif., in place of Roy Bucknell, retired.

FLORIDA

Rae Moore, Darlington, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

IDAHO

Roberta D. Keirnes, Pierce, Idaho., in place of C. N. Dundas, resigned.

Josephine McMurren, Welser, Idaho, in place of R. J. Wood, deceased.

ILLINOIS

Raphael V. McGreal, Chatsworth, Ill., in place of J. F. Donovan, transferred.

KENTUCKY

Daisy H. Hampton, Artemus, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Verne W. Dunham, Dover, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Vernon Hall, McDowell, Ky., in place of Willie Hall, declined appointment.

Mattie S. Catlett, Mount Eden, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Clyde W. Rice, Tyner, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

MICHIGAN

Ward Gibbs, Sixlakes, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MINNESOTA

Lucile M. Bell, Lake Elmo, Minn., in place of R. A. Collopy, transferred.

Peter F. Hipp, New Brighton, Minn., in place of O. E. Schaub, resigned.

Lillian S. Mahlum, Nisswa, Minn., in place of V. M. Parks, resigned.

MISSOURI

Emma E. Farrell, Point Lookout, Mo., in place of E. G. Wilson, resigned.

MONTANA

James P. Waters, Manhattan, Mont., in place of F. J. Hughes, deceased.

NEW MEXICO

Fannie T. Matthews, Columbus, N. Mex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Mabel D. Woods, Farmington, N. Mex., in place of J. H. Odle, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Birdie Allen, Clemmons, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NORTH DAKOTA

Milton I. Abell, Fortuna, N. Dak., in place of Cecil Wigness, transferred.

Ellen J. Powell, Powers Lake, N. Dak., in place of S. A. Lucy, resigned.

OREGON

William W. Wooddy, Corvallis, Oreg., in place of V. P. Moses, retired.

Hugh E. Watkins, Myrtle Point, Oreg., in place of E. A. Schroeder, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

Clifford G. Douthett, Cabot, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Annie M. Riegle, Freeburg, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

John J. Burchill, Smokerun, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Allan R. Newman, Chamberlain, S. Dak., in place of H. E. Henegar, deceased.

Margaret A. Jones, Cresbard, S. Dak., in place of D. L. Stewart, resigned.

UTAH

Lois C. Sargent, Coalville, Utah, in place of W. L. Sargent, deceased.

Carma C. Cutler, Kanosh, Utah. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

VIRGINIA

Linwood M. Latimer, Carrollton, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Alex Moore, Chuckatuck, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

John J. Wilson, Saint Brides, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

WASHINGTON

Kenneth J. Van House, Burton, Wash., in place of O. A. Carlson, transferred.

WEST VIRGINIA

Elmer O. Bowyer, Dundon, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Hezekiah H. Pine, Scott Depot, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 14 (legislative day of October 29), 1945:

FOREIGN SERVICE

TO BE ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO HUNGARY

H. F. Arthur Schoenfeld

TO BE CONSULS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

M. Williams Blake Herbert V. Olds
Overton G. Ellis, Jr. Roland Welch
Beppo R. Johansen Robert E. Wilson

TO BE FOREIGN-SERVICE OFFICERS, UNCLASSIFIED, VICE CONSULS OF CAREER, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

(Correction of names as nominated October 3, 1945)

Francis H. Colombat
Herbert D. Spivack

TO BE FOREIGN-SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 7, A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE, AND A CONSUL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Meredith Weatherby

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON, D. C.

Lynn U. Stambaugh, to be a member, Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, D. C., for a term expiring June 30, 1950.

POSTMASTERS

GEORGIA

Cyrus E. Tolbert, Omega.

MICHIGAN

Mina Cato, Ceresco.
Frank J. Nackerman, St. James.
Fred B. Mohr, Sherwood.
Paul E. Tekfer, Trenton.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Pauline E. Stanislaus, Wallace.

TENNESSEE

Louise White, Clairfield.
Hayden Glover, Elmwood.

WASHINGTON

J. Frank Hall, Edwall.
Lillian Brain, Thorp.

WISCONSIN

Jennie Ruld, Loretta.
Vivian A. Edberg, Radisson.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 14, 1945

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.
The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, chosen by Thee for great and blessed designs, we pray for Thy wisdom and vision to clear our motives, and for freedom from that vanity and selfishness which give only passing satisfaction. Oh, reveal unto us that certitude and teach us how to live a life that is good enough to endure forever. Forbid that we should think that a noble life can grow in godless soil, spurred only by ambitions that sting and blast our better natures. O Master, grant us a larger portion of Thy spirit that we may do the work entrusted to us, focusing our talents toward a more contented way of living, never thinking of a great God with a small outlook. We pray for maximums of belief, experience, service, and trust which will give to mankind the heights of love, of heaven, and God. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1471. An act to transfer certain land and personal property in Limestone County, Tex., to the State of Texas, acting by and through the State board of control.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (H. R. 4129) entitled "An act to provide for reorganizing agencies of the Government, and for other purposes."